CORK

30.00

REMARKS

ON THE

Rev. Mr. STANSER's *EXAMINATION*

OF THE

Rev. Mr. BURKE's LETTER OF INSTRUCTION

TO THE

C. M. of Nova-Scotia;

Together with

A REPLY

TO THE

Rev. Mr. COCHRAN's Fifth and Last LETTER to Mr. B.

PUBLISHED IN THE NOVA-SCOTIA GAZETTE;

As alſo

A Short Review of his former Letters,

AND THE

REPLIES WHICH WERE MADE.

Chohhmar Jehovah, imedou al derachim ou reouve ſhaelou lenithiboth hôlam (i zch dorah) ha tôb ou lechou bah ou mitſeou margoha le naphſhechim.——IRMIH.

Thus ſaith the Lord: ſtand on the ways, and ſee, and aſk of the old paths if this be the right way, and walk in it.—JER. vi. 16.

Halifax:

PRINTED BY A. GAY.

1805.

653999
20. 3. 57

REMARKS, &c.

THE Revd. Examiner draws a flattering picture of the Province of Nova-Scotia: it may be a highly favoured country;—but that no other country on earth unites ſo many circumſtances, which contribute to human happineſs, is a flouriſh of rhetoric;—this may paſs for one of theſe irreſiſtible traits of eloquence which his friend admires; but other men, who are not the dupes of empty ſound, may aſk, what has this to do with the Letter under Examination? Has Mr. B. made any remarks on the ſoil and climate of Nova-Scotia? has he endeavoured to rouſe theſe wolves and leapords from their ſlumber? in the whole of his publication he ſuppoſes them at a diſtance, and cautions his flock againſt their wiles. He did not compliment any of the inhabitants of Nova-Scotia with the appellation of wolf or leapord; he did not point out any deſcription of men concealing a dagger, and waiting an opportunity of plunging it into the heart of an unoffending and defenceleſs neighbour, when it could be done with impunity; if he had, he would well deſerve the execration of every man who boaſts the name of Chriſtian. *(Ex. p. 5.)* Mr. B. prays the Revd. Ex. in his next publication, to apply this ſtricture to its proper object. To enforce obedience to the Ruling Power, and to evince the merit of patience in ſufferings, was the object of that Letter, which Mr. S. ſo ſeverely cenſures.—The writer begs leave to aſſure him, that 'tis a leſſon of great impor-

tance to the Roman Catholics of Nova-Scotia; for whom the paltry privilege of teaching their own children at their own expence, is thought by ſome Rev. gentlemen too great an indulgence; though in the day of danger they have come forward with their fellow-ſubjects, and are always ready, when called on, to repel either a foreign or domeſtic foe.

The Rev. Ex. ſeems offended that the Catholics of Nova-Scotia were not informed that their anceſtors thought it lawful to murder Princes, and break their faith with Heretics: in his opinion that would have been the moſt eligible mode of inſtructing them in their relative duties to their Prince, and their fellow-ſubjects, of different religious perſuaſions; but as the Ex. admits that there are ſcarcely two men of the ſame way of thinking, even on common topics, he muſt not be ſurpriſed that Mr. B. thought otherwiſe, he thought, and continues to think, that to aſperſe the memory of his anceſtors with ſo foul an imputation, would have been ſomething worſe than ingratitude:—'twould have been an atrocious calumny, as he has ſhewn in his replies to P's Letters, and will appear more clearly from the anſwer of five Catholic Univerſities, to the queries propoſed by the Catholic Committee in England, at the requeſt of Mr. Pitt, who deſired authentic evidence that theſe imputed doctrines were not taught or believed by Catholics, before a relaxation of the penal laws took effect in that country.—*See the Anſwers, No.* 8.

The Rev. Ex. pretends that the profeſſed objects of Mr. B's Letter, (which are, he ſays, extremely laudible) occupy the ſmalleſt part of that publication: the greater part is filled with doctrines of an adverſe complexion, with plauſible miſrepreſentations of the tenets of the Romiſh Church, and a revival of its haughty pretenſions. *Ex. p.* 5. The Ex. thus inadverdently informs the public that ſuch doctrines as are aſcribed to Catholics by artful adverſaries, are not taught by C. Miſſionaries:—Mr. B. does not miſrepreſent—

ſent—he clearly ſtates the doctrine of Catholics: in an official letter to which he has affixed his name, he would not dare to miſrepreſent the tenets of the C. Church—he vindicates them from miſrepreſentation; he does not borrow colours from fanatical enthuſiaſts to paint the doctrines of the church; he finds the true colours in which it muſt appear to the unprejudiced and impartial eye, in her public profeſſion of faith, and in the doctrinal decrees of her councils—imputed doctrines he diſregards;—the diſingenuity of the declaimer he forgives, and pities the credulity of the dupe.

It has been remarked by ſome philoſopher that prejudice is a falſe glaſs, that it diſtorts every object;—but the writer was yet to learn that a glaſs, whether true or falſe could ſhew an object which does not exiſt at all:—in the whole of Mr. B's Letter, he has not once mentioned the Romiſh Church, nor has he ſaid a word of her privileges or pretenſions; how then it could occupy the greater part of that Letter is an inexplicable paradox. The unbiaſſed reader will eaſily conceive what may be expected from a writer, who under pretence of examining a Letter, ſubſtitutes to its contents the ſuggeſtions of his own imagination.

The Rev. Ex. conſulting his ſenſibility in preference to his underſtanding, bitterly inveighs againſt ſome reflections in the publication which he examines; in it there are ſome ſtrictures which may appear ſevere; but they don't affect the innocent: they were not intended for the Rev. Ex. or his friend, why pretend to feel the ſmart of a ſtroke intended for another? Mr. B. is inſenſible to the moſt pointed accuſations, and invidious inſinuations:—all ſhafts are blunt againſt conſcious innocence.

As the Rev. Mr. *Cochran*, in his firſt Letter under the ſignature of P, whilſt declaiming againſt the ſuppoſed democratical ſentiments of Mr. B. announced his own political creed purely democratical, as was ſhewn to demonſtration in the reply to that Letter, ſo his friend

friend and ally declaiming on the ſame ſubject, which ſeems to be a favourite theme, ſpeaks a language purely and ſimply democratical : " the duty of allegi-" ance," ſays he, *Ex. p.* 7. " ariſes from the firſt " principles of the ſocial compact ;" and a few lines after he ſays : " 'tis wrong to claim the benefit of a " contract without performing the conditions." Obedience therefore in the opinion of the Rev. Ex. is the effect of this compact, or if you will a conſequence reſulting from the contract of individuals with the Prince; and as oppreſſion is no part of the contract, the doctrine of non-reſiſtance is here, by neceſſary conſequence, excluded.

The coincidence of theſe powerful allies in the ſame democratical principle, which they pretend to cenſure, is not the effect of chance, though it may be inadvertent: predetermined to cenſure, and not finding a proper ſubject, they collect ſome garbled paſſages into one or more ſentences, ſo diſpoſed as to make them ſpeak a language in direct oppoſition to that intended by the author, and having by this artful contrivance conjured up a phantom for their purpoſe, their ſtrictures flow without reſtraint ; nature is unbent, and the real ſentiments of their hearts are diſcloſed, of this the Ex. gives a ſtriking inſtance :—in his firſt quotation from Mr. B's Letter he garbles three ſeveral paſſages, and forms them into one, in which the terms " *calumnious miſ-*" *repreſentations*," are ſo inſidiouſly diſpoſed as to have an immediate reference to the legiſlature, whereas in Mr. B's pamphlet they are aſcribed to Clergymen, who abjure the *Catholic*, and conform to the eſtabliſhed religion. Let the reader compare the Ex's quotation with the original, he'll be charmed with Mr. *Stanſer's* fidelity and candour in quoting paſſages from the work which he undertakes to examine ; and if he adds to this, the Rev. Mr. *Cochran's* quotation from the Biſhop of *Nova-Scotia's* Charge, he will exclaim with the Poet, " *par nobile fratrum* ;" " all who are acquainted with " their

" their character (the native Iriſh Romaniſts,) muſt " be ſenſible that they are naturally a compaſſionate, " friendly, hoſpitable people"—*Biſh. Ch. p.* 8. 1 *ed.*— Right Mr. Cochran! but why conceal the remainder of this remarkable paſſage? " yet under the malignant " influence of ſuperſtition, they will without remorſe, " plunge a dagger into the heart of that very perſon, " if he ſhould be what they call a heretic." Why ſuppreſs what follows? " they think they are ſerving " God and his truth by theſe enormities." The reader may imagine that Mr. *Cochran* thought a compliment, ſo honourable from ſo pious and learned a Prelate, might excite ſome ſentiments of native pride in theſe Iriſh Papiſts, and wiſely ſuppreſſed it. However, we who have not that boundleſs charity, which prevents vanity in others, at the expence of our own reputation for veracity, and who know how to catch the lineaments of fraud and flattery, very naturally conclude, that writers ſo ſteeled againſt conviction, who notoriouſly garble quotations from pamphlets written in plain Engliſh, and in the hands of the public, have not been very delicate in their citations from works confined to great libraries, and written in languages which the bulk of mankind does not underſtand; ſome of them in a language, which however mortifying to vanity, the writer has ſtrong reaſons to believe that neither the one or the other of theſe allies underſtands. When he hears ſuch men compare French writers; call one who has been, 'tis true, " a laborious compiler," the glory of French writers, he fancies that he ſees the old Senator repreſs the arrogance of the young Athenian, who wiſhed to have all the laws of Athens reformed. Have you ſtudied them? ſaid the Senator—No: know them firſt, and then decide, replies the Sage—'tis not difficult to make the application.

The frivolous pretence of vindicating the Legiſlature from any imputation, is aſſumed as a maſk to cover the moſt virulent attack and pointed invectives: Mr. B.

had

had aſſigned ſolid and ſufficient reaſons to juſtify the conduct of the Legiſlature for which he expreſſed, and entertains the greateſt reſpect and deference ; he ſaid, 'tis true, that ſome political characters, ſee the principles of Catholics disfigured in penal ſtatutes, and in this he is ſupported by the authority of *Hume*, whom Mr. *Cochran* calls an impartial hiſtorian, he ſays, " a " horror of Papiſts, however innocent—a terror of the " Conſpiracies of that ſect however improbable, the " Commons at all times endeavoured to excite." And again he ſays, " the adverſaries of the Papiſts ſeem to " have thought that no truth is to be told of Idolaters : " encouragement was given to informers as appears " from the memorable Plot of *Titus Oates*, and his " perjured gang of accomplices." " This abandoned " man Oates," ſays *Hume*, vol viii. 72, " when exa- " mined before the Council, betrayed his impoſtures " in ſuch a manner as would have diſcredited the moſt " conſiſtent ſtory, and the moſt reputable evidence ; " but the violent animoſity, which had been excited " againſt Catholics, made the public ſwallow the groſ- " ſeſt abſurdities, when they accompanied an accuſa- " tin againſt thoſe Religioniſts.

" The leaders of the party were ſo little ſcrupulous " as to endeavour by encouraging perjury, ſuborna- " tion, lies, impoſtures, and even ſhedding innocent " blood to gratify their ambition." vol. viii. 99.

The Ex. admits that the Catholic Religion was the eſtabliſhed religion in England, till the reign of *Henry* VIII. he might have added, without fearing a contradiction, that if the principles which he, his Biſhop, and other friends aſcribe to the Catholics, had been a part of their Creed, it might yet continue : the power of reſiſtance was as great in *Henry's* days as in the time of *James* II. : but the principle of obedience to the ruling Prince, whether a Chriſtian or a Heathen, was a part of the eſtabliſhed doctrine ; a doctrine which our anceſtors believed, and reduced to practice in the moſt trying circumſtances.

circumſtances. The cruelties exerciſed in *Henry's* reign were not by Papiſts: they were in poſſeſſion of their eſtates and religion before his birth, and were by him arbitrarily and tyrannically deprived of both. There were ſome cruelties committed in *Mary's* reign; but ſhe was *Henry's* daughter and *Elizabeth's* ſiſter. If the ſoftneſs of her ſex, or the lenity of the Chriſtian, had been a prominent feature in her character, ſhe would have been a moſt degenerate child. Add to this that *Mary* had a perſonal diſlike to ſome leading characters, *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, *Northumberland*, and others of King *Edward's* Council. "The King being "far gone in a conſumption, from a concern for preſerv- "ing the reformation, was perſuaded to ſet aſide the "ſucceſſion of his ſiſters *Mary* and *Elizabeth*, and of "the Queen of Scots, the firſt and laſt being Papiſts, "and *Elizabeth's* blood being tainted by Act of Par- "liament; and to ſettle the Crown by will upon Lady "*Jane Grey* . . . . . the King was a minor and "incapable of making a will . . . . . they ſet their "hands to the validity of it." *Neal, His. of Pur. ch.* 3.

"The judges who were appointed to draw up the "King's letters patent for the purpoſe, warmly object- "ed to the meaſure; they gave their reaſons before "the Council, and begged that a Parliament might be "ſummoned, both to give it force and free its partizans "from danger; they ſaid that the form was invalid, "and would not only ſubject the Judges, who drew it "up, but every Counſellor, who ſigned it, to the pains "of treaſon."—*His. of the Wars of England, p.* 170.

Thus we ſee *Cranmer* and *Ridley*, whoſe fate the Ex. laments, by their private authority, in the face of law and equity, diſregarding the official opinion of the Learned Judges, diſpoſing of a Crown, which of all right belonged to *Mary*. If ſhe had forgiven it we might be tempted to ſuſpect that ſhe had not a drop of *Henry's* blood in her veins. *Neal* giving a ſketch of *Mary's* character, ſays, *ch.* 3. "She had deep reſent-

" ments of her own ill uſage in her father's and bro-
" ther's times, which eaſily induced her to take re-
" venge, though ſhe covered it over with zeal againſt
" herefy. *Neal*, though a violent Anti-papiſt, aſſigns, the true motive of the perſecution in *Mary's* days, that is, the Queen's reſentment of perſonal injuries. That ſhe had cauſe for reſentment againſt *Cranmer*, is unqueſtionably true; he had declared her mother's marriage invalid; he had authoriſed by his preſence her father's marriage with *Anne Bolune*, even before that declaration; he had ſigned King *Edward's* pretended will in order to exclude her from the Crown, and had openly declared in favour of *Jane Gray*. Theſe facts, of which there exiſts not the ſhadow of a doubt, are not of the number of ſlight tranſgreſſions, which Princes eaſily forgive, there were other reaſons, which excited the indignation of the Queen and her courtiers, when in peaceable poſſeſſion of the throne, " what could be more provoking, ſays Mr. *Collier*, to " the court, than to ſee the Queen's honour aſperſed, " their religion inſulted, their preachers ſhot at in the " Pulpit, and a lewd impoſture played againſt the " Government? Had the reformed been more ſmooth " and inoffenſive in their behaviour; had the eminent " Clergy of that party publiſhed an abhorrence of ſuch " unwarrantable methods, it is poſſible, ſome ſay, that " they might have met with gentler uſage . . . . . " the miſbehaviour of ſome people about this time " ſeems to have ſoured the humour of the Court, and " brought the reformed under farther disfavour: for in-" ſtance one *Edward Featherſtone*, alias *Conſtable*, coun-" terfeited himſelf King *Edward* the Sixth . . . . . " he was ſeized, and confeſſed that he had been impor-" tuned by a great many to undertake the impoſture." The learned hiſtorian gives other inſtances, and concludes that from the jealouſy of men in power, ſometimes a whole party ſuffers for the faults of a few.

Does the Ex. imagine that Catholics don't feel injuries

ries like other Men? that the moral precepts of the Goſpel have ſuch force as to reſtrain all Men's paſſions and at all times? are there no delinquents amongſt Proteſtants? none who ſay with the Poet, " *video me-* " *liora proboque, deteriora ſequor?*

I ſee and approve what's right, and do what's wrong.

The principles of Catholics were well known in them days ſays our Ex.—true! but they were ſtrangely disfigured, as were their actions, by men whoſe intereſt was incompatible with a ſyſtem of religion, in the deſtruction of which they found wherewith to aggrandiſe themſelves and their aſſociates.—Of this we have authentic evidence: *Henry*, whoſe avarice kept pace with his luſt, which was the great ſpring of his actions, having in vain endeavoured to induce the Clergy to acknowledge his ſpiritual ſupremacy in order to enable him to diſmiſs an old wife, cauſed an indictment to be preferred againſt them in Weſtminſter Hall, on the ſtatutute of Præmunire, for acknowledging Cardinal *Woolſey's* legantine powers without the King's ſanction, and having obtained judgment on the ſtatute, the whole body of the Clergy were declared out of the King's protection, their goods and chattels forfeited to him. He, good man, offered pardon on two conditions: the firſt was that the provinces of Canterbury and York ſhould pay into the Exchequer £.118,840 ſterling, an immenſe ſum in 1530, when money was ſcarce and of proportionate value; the ſecond condition was that they ſhould acknowledge him *ſole Supreme Head* of *the Church:* this laſt condition was inadmiſſible: they qualified it by the addition of a clauſe deſtructive of its intent, that is, " as far as it is agreeable to the laws of Chriſt;" but what the Clergy in the moſt deſperate ſituation did not grant, the Parliament without their concurrence did ſhortly after, in the year 1533. By the Act of Supremacy, 26. Hen. 8th. Chap. 1ſt. " this, ſays *Neal*, was the riſe of the refor-

" mation: the whole power of reforming errors and " hereſies in doctrine and worſhip was transferred " from the Pope to the King, without any regard to " the rights of ſynods or Councils of the Clergy, and " without a reſerve of liberty to ſuch conſciences as " could not comply with the public ſtandard. This " was undoubtedly a change for the better, but is far " from being conſonant to ſcripture or reaſon."—— *Neal, ch. 1st. p.* 12.—*Neal* muſt have been a profound philoſopher to have diſcovered, that a change inconſiſtent with ſcripture and reaſon, our only rules of conduct, was for the better.

In conſequence of this parliamentary conceſſion, in virtue of his new, and till that unfortunate period unheard of Apoſtleſhip, *Henry*, under pretence of eſtabliſhing order to the religious houſes, but in reality to fill his exhauſted treaſury, and reward the ſervices of his creatures, appoints viſitors with the moſt extenſive powers. " *Cromwell*," ſays Mr. *Collier*,—*2nd part, 2nd book, p.* 104,—" being authoriſed by the King's " letters patent, under the broad ſeal, to conſtitute de- " puties for a viſitation made choice of *Richard Layton*, " *Thomas Leigh*, *William Petre*, doctors of the law; " Doctor *John London*, Dean of Walſingham, &c. for " this purpoſe . . . . . they were furniſhed at leaſt " ſome of theſe firſt named with a plenitude of power " to viſit all Archbiſhops, Biſhops, and the reſt of the " Clergy . . . . . and as to the Monaſteries, they had " as it were an unlimited authority."

Such were the powers conferred on *Thomas Cromwell*, an outcaſt from the dregs of *Putney*, a menial ſervant to *Cardinal Woolſey*, raiſed by this inſatiable Prince to high dignity, and conſtituted his Vicar General, " in which quality he ſat diverſe times in the " convocation houſe amongſt the Biſhops, as head over " them."—*Sir Richard Baker, p.* 408.—and theſe powers were ſtretched by the miſcreants whom he choſe for this memorable viſitation.

" The

" The images of a great many pretended ſaints were " taken down and burnt, and all the rich offerings " made at their ſhrines was ſeized for the crown, which brought an immenſe treaſure into the Exche- " quer."—*Neal, ch. 1st. p.* 19.—All Monaſteries under the yearly value of £.200 Sterling, were ſuppreſſed on the firſt report, they were 376 in number, and their yearly value £.32,000.—Plate, jewels, and furniture, £.100,000, the lead, bells, and other materials were ſold ; a new court called the court of augmentations of the King's revenue, to receive the rents, diſpoſe of the lands, and bring the profits into the Exchequer, was erected, 27. *Hen.* VIII. *chap.* 27, 28. Ten thouſand Monks, old and young, were ſent to ſhift for themſelves, each man with forty five ſhillings in his pocket. Shortly after followed the diſſolution of the great Abbeys ; they were rated at the yearly rent of £.131,607 6*s.* 4*d* but at leaſt were worth ten times as much in real value. Moſt of the abbey lands were given away amongſt the courtiers, or ſold at eaſy rates to the gentry, to engage them by intereſt againſt the reſumption of them to the church.—*Neal, ibidem*—thus this new Pope eſtabliſhed order in the religious houſes !

The men and means employed by *Henry* were well adapted to the end which this reforming Prince had in view. The deſtruction of abbeys, monaſteries, colleges, hoſpitals ; in a word, of all the monuments of ancient piety, was rapid beyond expreſſion under the direction of theſe architects of ruin. " England ſat ſigh- " ing and groaning, to ſee her wealth exhauſted, her " money embaſed and mingled with copper, abbeys " demoliſhed which were the monuments of ancient " piety, the blood of the nobility, prelates, papiſts, and " proteſtants, promiſcuouſly ſpilt, and the land em- " broiled in a war with Scotland."—*Camb. Intro. Hist. of Eliz.*

The miniſters employed in theſe ſcenes of ſacrilegious plunder had recourſe to means at which nature ſhudders :

ſhudders: Sir *William Dugdale* in his celebrated hiſtory of Warwickſhire, ſpeaking of the diſſolution of a monaſtery of nuns called Poleſworth, thence takes an occaſion to deſcribe the diſſolution of all the monaſteries and abbeys in England. "I find it left recorded by "the commiſſioners that were employed to take ſurrender of the monaſteries in this ſhire, An. 29. *Henry* VIII. that after ſtrict ſcrutiny not only by the "fame of the country, but by examination of ſeveral "perſons, they found theſe nuns virtuous and religious "women, and of good converſation. Nevertheleſs "it was not the ſtrict and regular lives of theſe devout "ladies, nor any thing that might be ſaid in behalf of "the monaſteries, that could prevent their ruin then "approaching. So great an aim had the King thereby "to make himſelf glorious, and many others no leſs "hopes to be enriched in a conſiderable manner; but "to the end that ſuch a change ſhould not overwhelm "thoſe, that might be active therein, in regard the "people every where had no ſmall eſteem of theſe "houſes for their devout and daily exercies in prayer. "Alms deeds, hoſpitality and the like, whereby not "only the ſouls of their anceſtors had much benefit, "as was then thought; but themſelves, the poor, as alſo "ſtrangers and pilgrims conſtant advantage; there "wanted not the moſt ſubtle contrivances to effect "this ſtupendous work, that I think any age has beheld. Whereof it will not be impertinent, I preſume, to take a ſhort view." This Learned Proteſtant hiſtorian deſcribes the men and meaſures employed in this work of darkneſs and devaſtation. The promotion of *Thomas Cromwell*, to the place of King's Vicar-General, the tragical fate of that arch villain, the promotion of *Cranmer* to the Archbiſhopric of Canterbury, and ſome others as proper inſtruments for ſuch a work; and in his deſcription he diſcloſes ſuch a complication of hell invented ſtratagems and monſtrous crimes as ſtartle horror itſelf.

To

To the teſtimony of this well informed Proteſtant writer, the writer begs leave to add that of Mr. *Thomas Hearn*, taken from his obſervations on Mr. *Brown Willis's* View of the Mitred Abbeys, " Popery, as I " take it," ſaid he, " ſignifies no more than the errors " of the Church of Rome, had he (*Henry* VIII.) there- " fore put a ſtop to thoſe errors, he had acted wiſely " and very much to the content of all truly good and " religious men, but then this would not have ſatisfied " the ends of himſelf and his covetous and ambitious " agents. They all aimed at the revenues and riches " of the religious houſes, for which reaſon no arts or " contrivances were to be paſſed by, that might be of " uſe in obtaining theſe ends. The moſt abominable " crimes were to be charged upon the religious, and the " charge was to be managed with the utmoſt dexterity, " boldneſs and induſtry. This was a powerful argu- " ment to draw an odium upon them, and to make " them diſreſpected and ridiculed by the generality of " mankind. And yet after all the proofs were ſo in- " ſufficient, that from what I have been able to gather, " I have not found any direct one againſt a ſingle mo- " naſtery. The ſins of one or two particular perſons " do not make a Sodom, neither are violent and " forced confeſſions to be eſteemed as the true re- " ſults of any one's thoughts. When therefore even " theſe artifices would not do, the laſt expedient was " put in execution, and that was ejection by force."

Burnet himſelf, though full of the moſt virulent animoſity againſt the monaſtic ſtate, acknowledges that in the nunnery of Godſtow, where all the gentlewomen of the country had their education, there was great ſtrictneſs of life.—*Hist. of the Ref. v.* 3, *p.* 238.— 'Twas here that ſacrilegious miſcreant *London*, was appointed viſitor, and behaved with brutal inſolence; he was afterwards convicted of perjury, and condemned to ride with his face to the horſes tail, at Windſor and Oakingham

Oakingham, with papers about his head declaring his crimes.

Henry and his miniſters did not find wherewith to ſatisfy their cravings in the plunder of the abbeys and monaſteries: they turned their eyes towards the Biſhoprics, "concerning which there goes a ſtory," ſays Doctor *Heylin*, "that after the Court harpies had devoured the greateſt part of the ſpoil, which came by the ſuppreſſion of monaſteries and abbeys, they began to look ſome other way to ſatisfy that greedy appetite, which the diviſion of the former booty had left unſatisfied, and for the ſatisfying of which, they found not any thing ſo neceſſary as the Biſhop's lands."

But there yet remained a ſomething to be gleaned in *Edward's* days: *Henry* had not yet aboliſhed the Maſs; the altars, of courſe, cenſers, chalices and candleſticks kept their place, ſome ſhrines and images remained, "on theſe," ſays Doctor *Heylin*, "ſome great men about the Court had caſt a longing eye, and under colour of removing ſuch corruptions as remained in the church, they were cried down, and the chantry lands parcelled out to the improvement of their own fortunes." Then ſpeaking of a propoſal from ſome of the Zuienglian party to pull down altars, he ſays, "the touching on this ſtring made excellent muſic to ſome of the grandees of the Court, who had before caſt many an envious eye on the coſtly hangings, the maſſy plate, and other rich and precious utenſils, which adorned thoſe altars . . . beſides there was no ſmall ſpoil to be made of copes, ſome of them made of cloth of tiſſue, of cloth of gold and ſilver or embroidered velvet. And might not theſe be converted to private uſes, to ſerve as carpets for their tables, coverlets to their beds, or cuſhions to their chairs and windows? Hereupon ſome rude people are encouraged to beat down ſome altars, which makes way for an order of the Council-table to take down

" down all the reſt, and ſet up tables in their places,
" followed by a commiſſion to be executed in all parts
" of the kingdom for ſeizing of the premiſes for the
" uſe of the King. But as the grandees of the Court
" intended to defraud the King of ſo great a booty, and
" the Commiſſioners to put a cheat upon the Court
" Lords, who employed them in it; ſo they were both
" prevented in ſome places by the Lords and gentry,
" who thought the altar cloths, together with the copes
" and plate of ſeveral churches, to be as neceſſary for
" themſelves as others."—*Pref.*

" The Parliament met on the 4th of November, in
" which the cards were ſo well packed, that there was
" no need of any other ſhuffling to the end of the game;
" becauſe they all agreed in the common principle,
" which was to ſerve the preſent time . . . . for tho'
" a great part of the nobility, and not a few of the
" gentry in the Houſe of Commons, were cordially af-
" fected to the church of Rome, yet were they willing
" to give way to all ſuch acts and ſtatutes as were
" made againſt it, out of a fear of loſing ſuch church
" lands as they were poſſeſſed of, if that religion ſhould
" prevail and get up again. And as for the reſt who
" either came to make, or improve their fortunes, there
" is no queſtion to be made, but they came to further
" ſuch a reformation as ſhould moſt viſibly conduce to
" the advancement of their ſeveral ends, which appears
" plainly by the ſtrange mixture of the acts and reſults
" thereof."—*Hey. p.* 47 & 48.

The meaſures adopted by theſe artful men were perfectly correſpondent to their flagitious purſuits: 'tis not therefore difficult to aſſign the motives which induced them to disfigure, and miſrepreſent the doctrines of that church, the deſtruction of which muſt enſure them ſucceſs: Vows of celibacy of obedience, &c. were declared unlawful and impracticable, to enable them to ſeize on the abbey lands, and all the wealth of the monaſteries;—crimes which were never committed, were

 ſuppoſed

ſuppoſed, and induſtriouſly circulated to ſilence the murmurs and complaints of the public, at ſeeing the property conſecrated by the piety of their anceſtors; and in which they found an aſſured reſource for themſelves and their children embezzled by the Exchequer, and ſquandered on Court minions:—"they repreſent-"ed their offences in ſuch multiplying glaſſes, as made "them both greater in number, and more horrid in "nature, than indeed they were."—*Hey. p.* 202.

Sir William Dugdale aſſerts, "that the Commiſ-"ſioners threatened to charge the Canons of Leiceſter "with buggery and adultery, unleſs they would ſub-mit."

Burnet admits that complaints were made of the violence and bribery of the viſitors, and adds, perhaps not without reaſon, ſo great is the force of truth, that it has extorted a confeſſion even from *Burnet*, and in his abridgement, p. 182, he ſays, "'twas complain-"ed that Doctor *London* had corrupted many nuns." *Burnet's* attempt to aſperſe the chaſtity of the nuns, expoſes to the hatred and deteſtation of the world, the viſitor and the men who employed and inſtructed him.

The ſacrifice of the Maſs aboliſhed, altars and all the ornaments of the Churches became uſeleſs. The plate and jewels conſecrated by the piety of the faithful, during a ſpace of nine centuries, fell at once into the coffers of the Court, and its favourites.

The doctrine of purgatory rejected, the univerſal practice of praying for the dead muſt be aboliſhed, a practice as old as Chriſtianity, a practice in uſe amongſt the Jews long before the birth of Chriſt, as appears from the hiſtory of the Maccabees, which, whether canonical or not, is a correct Jewiſh hiſtory. Hence all the chantery lands founded for perpetuating prayers for the faithful departed, fell to the crown.

Finally by pretending that the veneration which Catholics always expreſſed for the relicks of ſaints, a veneration which Moſes ſhewed to the remains of the patriarch

patriarch Joſeph, favoured of idolatry, ſhrines and reliquaries of immenſe value became a prey to the ſordid and ſacrilegious avarice of men, who ſeem to have literally reduced to practice that leſſon which *Horace*, in the true ſpirit of irony, gave to his fellow-citizens. "*Rem recte ſi possis ſi non, quocumque modo, rem . . .* "*oh Cives, Cives, quærenda eſt pecunia primum, Vir-* "*tus poſt Nummos.*"

Once more were not theſe men under an irreſiſtible temptation of miſrepreſenting, and calumniating the tenets of that church, in the ſpoils of which they found the aggrandiſement of themſelves and their families? was not Mr. *Burke* perfectly right in aſſerting that they were intereſted in ſuppreſſing Catholic doctrine through political views.

Sir *William Davenant* deſcribes the deſtruction effected by theſe zealous reformers in the following lines:

"Who ſees theſe diſmal heaps but will demand,
"What barbarous invaders ſacked the land?
"But when he hears no Goth no Turk did bring,
"This deſolation, but a Chriſtian King;
"When nothing but the name of zeal appears,
"'Twixt our beſt actions and the worſt of theirs.
"What does he think our ſacrilege would ſpare?
"Since theſe the effects of our doctrines are."

To conclude this article—if ſuch men were directed by heaven, and ſuch meaſures ſuggeſted by the H. G. we muſt acquit the devil of all the wickedneſs, which is practiſed in this world, and acknowledge that his ſable Majeſty, though called the father of lies, is himſelf foully belied in every indictment which is preferred for murder, perjury, ſacrilege, &c.

The writer has not cited one Catholic author: if he were to ſet before the eyes of the public, ſcenes painted by *Saunders*, by *Stapleton*, *Hollywood*, and *Daly*, and ſome other cotemporary writers, horror would grow impatient, and reaſon ſtand appalled, at the unparalleled enormities committed under pretence of reforming religion, and reducing it to the primitive ſtandard.

The writer does not intend, or even pretend, to make the moſt diſtant alluſion to the preſent times: he knows that the men who now exiſt, are no more accountable for the crimes of their anceſtors, than he is himſelf for the maſſacres, rapine, ſacrilege, and all the other crimes committed by the mercileſs Danes, his anceſtors, in their different incurſions.

The Ex. in imitation of other pamphleteers collects a ſummary of what he calls Catholic doctrine, not from Catechiſms, Manuels, Profeſſions of faith, or any authentic ſource; but from the miſrepreſentation of party writers, who finding it impoſſible to refute any article of Catholic doctrine fairly ſtated, garble ſome quotations from obſcure writers of no authority, and diſtort the words of others from their intended ſignification, and thus compoſe a creed for us, of which we believe no more than we do of the Alcoran. The more abſurd this pretended creed, the better it anſwers the inventor's purpoſe. The confidence with which they obtrude their own fabrications on the credulity of the public in the face truth, excites aſtoniſhment. If Catholic writers reclaim, they inſtantly reply, that Catholic doctrine is miſrepreſented by Catholics, as if they were authoriſed to compoſe our creed. All theſe barefaced impoſitions have been abundantly refuted in Mr. B's replies to P. The writer adds that the Rev. Ex. groſſly impoſes on his readers, when he ſays that the Legiſlative Body imputes thoſe doctrines to Catholics: their propoſing an oath to Catholics is evidence of the contrary; for if they thought an oath incapable of binding Catholics, 'twould be uſeleſs to propoſe it. The Legiſlature obliges Catholics to diſclaim theſe tenets, which are imputed to them by Meſſrs. *Stanſer* and *Cochran*, and other party writers, who in order to excite an odium againſt Catholics, pretend to know our doctrine better than we do ourſelves. Catholics have diſclaimed them, and given the Legiſlature a pledge of their fidelity, which Catholics only can give, that is, their

their ſolemn tried and inflexible faith, which no penal rigour could extort for more than a century. The man who hears this, and pretends to ſuſpect the oath of a Catholic, does not know our faith, or he does not know the truth.

The writer begs leave to correct a verſion of a papal decree given by Mr. *Stanſer*—'tis quoted in the original, and the tranſlation, whether through ignorance, deſign, or inadvertence, is ſtrained to ſerve a purpoſe :—" *Ex-* " *communicæmus & anathematizamus omnem hæreſim* " *extollentem ſe adverſus hanc ſanctam, orthodoxam &* " *Catholicam fidem, quam ſuperimus expoſuimus . . . .* " *condemnantes hereticos univerſos, quibuſcumque nomi-* " *nibus cenſeantur : faces quidem diverſas habentes ſed* " *Caudas ad invicem alligatas, quia de Vanitate conve-* " *nunt in idipſum.*"

The Ex. in his verſion, artfully paſſes unnoticed the terms which determine the ſenſe of the decree, and point out the perſons againſt whom 'twas enacted :— " We excommunicate," ſays he, " every hereſy againſt " the Holy Orthodox and Catholic Faith,"—whereas in the decree 'tis ſaid :—" we excommunicate every he- " reſy raiſing itſelf againſt the true Orthodox and Ca- " tholic Faith, *which we have already expoſed.*" The faith which the Prelates had expoſed, was the myſteries of the trinity, the incarnation, the creation, &c. againſt the Manicheans, under different denominations who denied them. Thus our Ex. transfers, by his private authority, a ſentence denounced in 1198, againſt the moſt impious and flagitious of men, who pretended that the Devil was the creator of the world, to Proteſtants who made their firſt appearance in 1518.

Other faults in his verſion are paſſed unnoticed: they ſeem to argue no great knowledge of the learned languages. This may caution the public againſt taking the ſenſe of any Latin quotation on his authority.

In anſwer to his quotation from *Bellarmine*, the writer

writer would adviſe the Ex. ſeriouſly to peruſe the works of that celebrated controvertiſt: he will find in them ſuch concluſive evidence in ſupport of Catholic doctrine as ſuch, and ſuch irreſiſtible force of reaſoning againſt all new-fangled ſyſtems of religion, as have rendered every attempt at refutation vain, and few attempts were made. His private opinion of Papal power in temporals is founded on meer conjecture, he does not offer it as Catholic doctrine. It has been deciſively refuted in the Univerſities of France and Spain, as 'twas in Mr. B's Letter of Inſtruction. A more unfounded conjecture is not in the whole work, than that which this Ex. has borrowed—'tis manifeſtly againſt hiſtory: in Julian's days Pagans were comparatively few: on this all hiſtorians agree.

The Ex. without adducing a ſingle quotation from the Council of Trent, confidently aſſerts that all theſe abſurd doctrines invented by himſelf and his friends for Catholics, were diſtinctly and expreſſly taught by that Council.—The aſſertion is ſimply falſe and groundleſs: the Council taught no ſuch doctrines—the writer believes the Council infallible in all its doctrinal decrees, and does not believe a ſyllable of this doctrine which the Ex. aſcribes to it, and he begs leave to inform him, that he pretends, without vanity, to underſtand the doctrine of the Council of Trent, as well as Mr. S. or Mr. C. who in all appearance never read a line in its decrees.

"How far," ſays the Ex. p. 13, "the decrees of "Popes are binding upon Roman Catholics, may be "ſeen in the Creed of *Pius* IV. which is the ſtandard "of their religion;" is the Ex. ſo ignorant of Catholic doctrine as not to know that the ſtandard of that doctrine was fixed ſome centuries before *Pius* IV. was born? or has he ſeen any of theſe tenets which he aſcribes to Catholics in that profeſſion of faith compiled by *Pius's* order? has he diſcovered that we Catholics are obliged to believe in the decrees of Popes? the writer

writer has now that profeſſion of faith before him, and is not clearſighted enough to diſcover any ſuch thing: —" I likewiſe undoubtedly receive and profeſs all other " things delivered, defined and declared by the ſacred " Canons, and general Councils, and particularly by the " holy Council of Trent." All this the writer ſincerely receives and profeſſes; in it there is not one word of Popes decrees. *Gregory* I. ſurnamed the Great, to whom England owes her converſion from the moſt ſtupid idolatry and barbarous ſuperſtition, in his confeſſion of faith—*Lib.* 1. *Epiſt.* 25.—ſays, " that " he received the four general Councils—of Nice, of " Conſtantinople, of Epheſus, and of Chalcedon, as " the four books of the Goſpel." The deciſions of general Councils were thought infallible. *Gregory* ſays nothing of the decrees of Popes, nor does the profeſſion of faith authoriſed by *Pius* IV. As to the obedience which we Catholics owe the Pope, 'tis perfectly conſiſtent with our obedience and allegiance to our Prince: it extends to nothing unjuſt or unlawful. If the King and Parliament, and every other conſtituted authority in England, to which both Mr. B. and Mr. S. have ſworn obedience, ſhould order them to ſeduce a neighbour's wife or daughter, they ought not to obey: becauſe the obedience which they owe to a higher power, forbids it.—In like manner, if the Pope or any other authority under him, ſhould order us Catholics to withdraw our allegiance, or break our plighted faith, we would not obey: becauſe a Higher Power orders us to obey honor and ſerve our King, and religiouſly perform our engagements.

To conclude this article, 'tis matter of ſurpriſe, that Mr. S. ſhould give the profeſſion of faith of *Pius* IV. for a ſtandard of Catholic faith, and at the ſame time endeavour to perſuade the public, that doctrines, not one of which is to be found, even by implication, in that profeſſion of faith, are believed by us.

A ſketch of *Cranmer's* character, taken from his great

great admirer *Burnet*, will be given hereafter. *Ridley* and *Latimer* were engaged in the ſame treaſonable conſpiracy for which he ſuffered. " Doctor *Ridley*, " Biſhop of London, the 16th of July, at St. Paul's " Croſs, preached a ſermon, wherein he invited the " people to ſtand firm to Queen *Jane*, whoſe cauſe " he affirmed was moſt juſt."—*Baker's Hist. p.* 215. The writer is humbly of opinion that if the Rev. Ex. himſelf or his powerful ally, had been engaged in ſupporting the pretenſions of a King *Guilford*, or a Queen *Jane*, againſt the rightful heir of the crown, they would deſervedly ſhare *Ridley's* fate: a pretext of propping a tottering church would not ſave their necks from the haltar.

As to the puniſhments inflicted on heretics, Mr. B. has ſhewn in his replies to P. that they were decreed by the civil power, without any participation of the eccleſiaſtical authority; that to accuſe the Church of encouraging them is an unfounded ſlander. That ſome eccleſiaſtics, actuated by the ſpirit of revenge or ambition, might have encouraged them is true; but nothing to the purpoſe. *Bonner* and *Gardiner* were of the number. They had been roughly handled in the reign of *Edward* VI. at no time poſſeſſed of that ſpirit of meekneſs and patience which characterize the Chriſtian Prelate. Whilſt *Heath*, the Archbiſhop of York, and *Oglethorpe*, Biſhop of Carliſle, with the Biſhops of Oxford and Glouceſter, of Worceſter and Hereford, diſcountenanced all rigorous meaſures. *Alphonſus*, a Spaniſh Friar, Confeſſor to King *Philip*, preached vehemently againſt perſecution, and made the moſt pointed ſtrictures againſt ſome of the Biſhops, who reſorted to a method of converting ſinners condemned by the Chriſtian law, and only in uſe amongſt heathens.

From ſeveral miſtranſlations in this pretended Examination, the writer begins to ſuſpect that the Rev. Ex. does not underſtand the language in which the civil

vil and canon law is written. Thus for example, —" *Exterminaire*," he tranſlates to extirpate. In the legal ſenſe it ſignifies to baniſh *extra terminos*. To extirpate, is to root out, to deſtroy.

After having proved his firſt poſition, " that we Ca-" tholics think it lawful to break faith with heretics, " in his uſual mode by theſe irrefragable reaſons," *it is certain*; *the world knows*. And an anecdote of a Jewiſh girl, told by an anonymous friend, the Ex. proceeds to the ſecond, " that we Catholics think dupli-" city and deceit in general lawful."—For this he adduces ſomething more than his old proof *it is certain*, that is a garbled quotation from the *Decretum* of *Gratien*, of which Catholics never heard. The writer begs leave to inform this Rev. Ex. of what he does not ſeem to know, that *Gratien's* object in compiling that work, was to reconcile ſeeming inconſiſtencies, in which he was more than once inconſiſtent with himſelf and with truth, as the Univerſity of Paris had ſhewn in defence of its cenſure againſt *Monteſſon*—ſee *Rep. to P.*]—that this is one of his errors is manifeſt, from a miſquotation of St. *Paul*. In the Vulgate the text has, " *in ſimilitudimen Carnis peccati*:" in the original Greek *en omoiòmati ſarkos amartias*," in plain Engliſh: in the likeneſs of fleſh of ſin, and in the intended ſenſe of the Apoſtle, " in fleſh like to " that of ſin, or ſubject to ſin." The Ex. has given it: *in ſimulationem carnis peccatricis*, a manifeſt perverſion of the text, and even that he miſtranſlates: " *the falſe* " *appearance of ſinful fleſh*." Simulation is a plain Latin word which does not ſignify *a falſe appearance*, but the art of concealing a truth, which a man is not obliged to reveal: as if a traveller on his way to Annapolis, through Windſor, from Halifax, ſhould reply to this impertinent queſtion—whither are you going? I'm on the way to Windſor. When a man is juridically interrogated by proper authority no ſuch evaſion is allowed.—*See Rep. to P.*

This Rev. Ex. proceeds to quote from *Gratien*, "be-"hold what lies are venial and what are damnable,"—who would imagine that ſo powerful a controvertiſt as this Ex. would thus invalidate the whole force of the argument which he draws from the Decretum, cited in capitals, and adding ſo much weight to his former proofs, "*it is certain*; the world *knows*; *every body who knows* "*any thing of the Romiſh religion knows*.". Now the writer, who knows ſomething of the Romiſh religion, tells this Rev. Ex. that we Catholics do think that ſome lies are venial, and ſome are damnable, without thinking any lie either laudable or lawful: for we have not yet learnt to believe even on the evangelical authority of the Wirtemberg Evangeliſt *Martin*, that all ſins are equally damnable; we think that an act of intemperance on the King's Birth Day is not ſo damnable a crime as murder; we think that an amuſing jeſt is not inductive of perdition, tho' atrocious calumny moſt certainly is, and this our doctrine is ſo evidently founded on reaſon, that *Horace*, an Epicurean poet, believed it.

The Pope if we believe, this Ex. has actually granted a previous diſpenſation from the oath of allegiance. Mr. B. has ſhewn the contrary; and experience ſhews that no diſpenſations are granted: if they were Engliſh Catholics might by a ſingle oath relieve themſelves from all penal reſtrictions and diſabilities:—But here's another decree,—"all oaths contrary to the ad-"vantage of the Romiſh Church are to be conſidered "rather as perjuries than oaths." The Ex. had added the term *Romiſh* by his own private authority: he takes theſe trifling liberties of adding and retrenching when neceſſary to fix the ſenſe which ſerves his purpoſe. He then proceeds to ſtate that 'tis the buſineſs of the Romiſh Church to determine what is its own intereſt, and conſequently extend diſpenſations to every oath. This is a new idea of a diſpenſation. To declare that a lawful oath is an act of perjury, is a power for which

the

the Roman See is indebted to Mr. *Stanfer*; that an unlawful oath is an act of perjury was never doubted by any man, not yet fitted for a madhouſe, and if ſuch a declaration be a diſpenſation, Mr. B. has granted it to all United Iriſhmen without conſulting the Pope, and the writer will grant it to all ſocieties, who oblige themſelves by oath to purſue any unlawful end; he thinks the King's governors could grant ſuch diſpenſations without any remorſe of conſcience. The Ex. will remark that in the days of *Innocent* III. there were legal exemptions in favour of the eſtabliſhed Church, as there are yet in England; that an oath in prejudice of theſe legal exemptions is unlawful, and conſequently invalid, this Rev. Ex. muſt acknowledge, or admit that the White Boys, the Oak Boys, the Steel Boys, and all others who ſuffered on account of tythes, were murdered under colour of law.

Though not the ſhadow of an argument appears in 22 pages of this Examination, if you except two or three garbled quotations, which are eaſily explained. Mr. *Stanfer* concludes with confidence that he has ſhewn certain doctrines to form a part of the Romiſh religion, which that religion ſeverely condemns in his anceſtors the prime reformers, and which have been authentically condemned by the very Councils to which he aſcribes them, thus the noted *Weſtley* imputes to Catholics the riots in London, in 1780, when 100,000 aſſociated fanatics, with Lord *George Gordon* at their head, burned the Houſes and Chapels. Confidence in aſſertion in made a ſubſtitute to proof, yet the man's face muſt be ſeaſoned againſt ſhame, who publicly avows a notorious falſehood. In his next edition the Ex. would do well to remember this philoſophical maxim, that aſſertion is no proof; that a ſimple denial is a ſufficient refutation of a bare aſſertion; that a ſilly attempt to ſupport a bad cauſe, makes it worſe, and reflects a ſort of diſcredit on the head or heart of the author—frequently on both.

In his account of the elevation of *Saul* and *David*, to the throne of *Iſrael*, Mr. *Stanſer* gives a ſtrong ſpecimen of the pretended right of every man to underſtand the Scriptures according to his own fancy: a more fanciful account is hardly poſſible. The interference of the people he totally excludes, and adds that God had declared their incompetency. If we believe him, the whole right of governing the people was communicated by *Samuel*, whatever was done by the people was meer matter of form and ceremony, ſomething ſimilar to that of an Engliſh Coronation. 'Tis ſtrange that neither *Saul* nor *David* thought ſo:— Some years after *David* had been anointed by *Samuel*, he conſidered *Saul* as his lawful Sovereign; nor does it appear that *Saul* at any time thought himſelf a rebel. *Iſboſeth* was not anointed by *Samuel*, yet neither he nor his General *Abner*, were ever called rebels by any man before this Ex. which muſt have been the caſe if his expoſition of the ſcripture be true.

David himſelf thought *Iſboſeth* an innocent man, who had been murdered without cauſe by his own officers, and put them to death for that very crime; and though it be manifeſt, that *Abner's* influence had placed *Iſboſeth* on the throne of *Iſrael*, whilſt the men of *Juda* obeyed *David*, their kinſman, we find no accuſation of rebellion brought againſt *Abner* on this account.

The reader will admire Mr. *Stanſer's* accuracy, and deep penetration, in his interpretation of the Scriptures. *Saul* and *David* were veſted with the ſupreme authority, without the conſent of the people, in conſequence of God's immediate appointment, ſignified by *Samuel*. *Jeroboam* was guilty of rebellion, impiety, and idolatry, —why ſo? becauſe he was choſen by ten tribes out of the twelve, who thought proper to conſtitute him their King. The Ex. will find it difficult to aſſign any other reaſon, which founds his accuſation of rebellion againſt *Jeroboam*: with reſpect to the divine appoint-

ment

ment he was upon equal terms with *David*:—*David's* appointment was during the lifetime of *Saul*, and *Jeroboam's* during the lifetime of *Solomon*:—"And it "came to pass at that time that *Jeroboam* went out of "Jerusalem, and the prophet *Ahias* the Silonite, clad "with a new garment, found him in the way; and "they two were alone in the field; and *Ahias* taking "his new garment wherewith he was clad, divided it "into twelve parts; and he said to *Jeroboam* take to "thee ten pieces: for thus saith the Lord God of Is-"rael; behold I will rend the kingdom out of the "hand of *Solomon* and give thee ten tribes."—1*st. of K. 2nd. ch. Jeroboam* was so far from being a rebel, that if he had continued to serve his God, after he had taken possession of the kingdom of *Israel*, his throne would have been established over *Israel* as that of *David's* was over *Juda*;—"and thou shalt be king over *Israel*," continues the prophet, "if then thou shalt "hearken to all which I shall command thee, and "wilt walk in my ways, and do what is right before "me, keeping my precepts and my commandments, "as my servant *David* did, I will be with thee and "build thee up a faithful house as I built a house for "*David*, and I will deliver *Israel* to thee." That *Jeroboam* possessed no regal power, nor even claimed any, till constituted King over the ten tribes by themselves, Mr. S. will hardly dispute; that this was done in the ordinary course of providence the Scripture attests: "and the King did not condescend to the people: be-"cause the Lord had turned away from him to make "good his word, which he had spoken in the "hand of *Ahias*, to *Jeroboam*, the son of *Nabat*."——1*st. Ch. ch.* xii. From this last, 'tis manifest that God did not enlighten the understanding of *Roboam*, so as to discover the folly of his young counsellors.—"And "it came to pass when all *Israel* heard that *Jeroboam* "had come again, that they collected an assembly, and "sent and called him, and made him King over *Israel*:

"and

"and there was none who followed the houſe of *Da-*
"*vid* but the tribe of *Juda*." A more unlucky example Mr. S. could not have found to ſhew the incompetency of the people who rejected *Roboam*, and ſubſtituted *Jeroboam*, were guilty of any act of rebellion, if God be not the author of rebellion: for the Scripture ſays poſitively, that "this word was from "God." After this, *Jeroboam* fell into idolatry, and many of the people followed his example, for which, and other crimes enumerated in the Scriptures, they were deſervedly puniſhed; but that they were then guilty of idolatry, impiety, and rebellion, is a flat contradiction to the Scripture; a neceſſary conſequence of that pretended right of ſubſtituting the reader's fancy, to the intended ſenſe of the ſacred penman.

In the next paragraph this Rev. Ex. gives a greater range of his fancy: he makes the ten tribes from *Roboam's* days, to the tranſmiſgration rebels to a man. "God," he ſays, "expreſsly excludes the people from "electing their Prince, and reſerves the choice in every "caſe to himſelf: the appointments which he thus de-"clared to be with himſelf he actually and univerſally "exerciſed: the three firſt, *Saul*, *David*, and *Solomon*, "he appointed by name, and then eſtabliſhed an heredi-"tary Government in the family of *David*."—*p.* 30. There are in this ſtatement as many errors as lines. We don't find that *Solomon* was appointed by name with an indefeaſible right: *David* promiſed his mother *Bathſheba*, that he ſhould be his ſucceſſor, and ordered him in conſequence to be anointed by the High Prieſt *Sadoc*, at her requeſt. "As I have ſworn to thee, by "the Lord God of *Iſrael*, ſaying, *Solomon* thy ſon ſhall "reign after me, and he ſhall ſit on my throne, thus "will I do this day."—1*ſt. Ch. ch.* i. 30.—Firſt error, *Jeroboam* was appointed by name King of *Iſrael*, whom this Ex. calls a rebel—Second error, that *David* was immediately nominated, and a continuation of the family of *David*, over the tribe of *Juda* predicted, is

true;

true; but that an hereditary indefeaſible right in that family, to rule all *Iſrael*, was either eſtabliſhed or predicted, is a ſtupid error, which betrays in the author almoſt conſummate ignorance of theſe Scriptures to which he refers with ſuch confidence.

'Tis ſaid of *Solomon*, "and I will eſtabliſh his king-"dom for ever, if he continue to keep my command-"ments and my judgments as at this day."—1. *Ch.* xxviii. 7. Theſe are the terms on which *Jeroboam's* right was eſtabliſhed by the prophet *Ahias*, yet he was never thought to poſſeſs an indefeaſible right. From this Ex'rs. reaſoning we ſhould conclude that all the King's of *Iſrael*, and even *Jeroboam* himſelf, though appointed as *Saul* and *David*, were uſurpers, and all the men who acknowledged them Sovereigns, rebels to their lawful Princes: No length of time preſcribes againſt the ordinance of God.

The writer paſſes unnoticed, ſome ridiculous principles which are imputed by the Ex. to Mr. B; they enable him to conjure up a ſubject, on which he declaims with ſome aſperity, and fills a pamphlet, which if ſtripped of theſe adventitious ornaments, and confined to logical reaſoning, would be reduced to half a ſheet.

His remark, that if the people had the power of conſtituting their King, they might defeat the plan reſpecting the Meſſias, is wonderfully acute: it ſhews the depth of this laborious Ex'rs. reſearches; the accuracy of his notions with reſpect to a ſuperintending providence: 'tis to be hoped that his next eſſay will eſtabliſh the *ineluctabile fatum* of the heathens; and juſtify *Pilate's* ſentence againſt the Redeemer, *Judas's* treachery, and the malice of the *Jews:* if theſe could have done otherwiſe, they would have defeated the plan of the redemption. And *Saul* might have defeated the plan of the Meſſias moſt effectually; for *Samuel* ſaid to him, "thou haſt done fooliſhly, and haſt not "kept the commandments of the Lord thy God, which

"he

" he commanded thee: and if thou hadſt not done this " the Lord would have eſtabliſhed thy kingdom over " *Iſrael* forever."—1 *Sam.* xiii. 13.—'Tis therefore manifeſt, that if *Saul* had not ſacrilegiouſly offered ſacrifice, not being of the *Prieſtly* race, his kingdom would have ſtood, and *David* would have been excluded; 'tis equally manifeſt that *Saul* might have omitted that offering: for diſobedience is no crime when obedience is impoſſible. In this we Catholics revere the preſcience of God, and the wonderful diſpoſitions of his providence, which directs all his creatures to their proper end, at the ſame time preſerving their nature and all their natural properties entire and untouched: and if in the courſe of his providence any thing tranſcend our underſtanding, we have the modeſty to admit that God can do more than we can conceive. We have not the inſolence to pretend, that if ſuch and ſuch an event ſhould happen, God's purpoſe would have been defeated. Theſe ſentiments we reſign to the Ex. and his friends. We ſay with the prophet, " *attingius a fine uſque in finem fortiter* " *& ſuaviter omnia diſponens.*"—*Sap. ch.* viii. 1.

The writer admires another ſtretch of the Ex's. fancy: he finds that 'twas expreſsly revealed that the Meſſias was not only to be *Abraham's* race, but alſo the ſon of *David, and of all the Kings of Juda:* he has not told us by what prophet. 'Tis true he ſpecifies *Jacob.* But *Jacob* did not ſpeak a word of *David* or his family. His prophecy is applicable to the whole tribe of *Juda.* And St. *Luke*, who ought to know ſomething of the matter, was ſo far from thinking that the Meſſias ought to have been ſon to all the Kings of *Juda*, that he has not placed one of them in the genealogy from *David* down to *Eli*, who was father to the Bleſſed Virgin, and the only father which J. C. could have on earth. St *Matthew* does; but he gives the genealogy of St. *Joſeph*, not of the Bleſſed Virgin; 'twas enough for his purpoſe to ſhew that he was of the

the houſe of *David*, which appeared from her being of the ſame tribe and family with *Joſeph*. That St. *Luke* gave the true genealogy of the Meſſias, ſeems clear from his manner of ſpeaking: he omits the article *tou* before *Joſeph*, and places it before *Eli*, and thence up to *Nathan*, ſon of *David*.

After having given theſe irreſiſtible proofs of his deep ſkill in interpreting the Scriptures according to his eſtabliſhed maxim, fancy, our Rev. Ex. proceeds to vindicate *Blackſtone*, and *Bracton*: in this he diſplays his legal powers of chicane: logical inferences are beneath his notice. However as it does not appear that Mr. B. borrowed any principles from theſe lawyers, whom he neither approved nor cenſured, the writer paſſes unnoticed this part of the Exm'rs. publication. He begs leave ſimply to inform the Ex. that theſe democratical principles, which he ſo liberally beſtows on Mr. B. are not to be found in that gentleman's Letter of Inſtruction, whilſt the moſt abſolute democracy is the profeſſed principle both of the Ex. and his friend P. if they underſtand the force of the terms in which they have announced their political creed. Add to this the juſtification of *Huſs*, and *Wiclef*, who were profeſſed Levellers. The man who approves will practice, if the opportunity offers.

The Ex. comes next to examine that part of Mr. B's Letter of Inſtruction, which treats of political power, and expreſſes his ſurpriſe at Mr. *Burke's* attempting to ſhew that all temporal juriſdiction is veſted in the King, by denying that he has any ſpiritual authority, power or juriſdiction whatever. The writer is not leſs ſurprized that this Rev. Ex. knowing there were a 1000 copies of that Letter of Inſtruction publiſhed, each containing a direct and authentic contradiction to this ſtatement, would permit prejudice and party ſpirit to warp his underſtanding to the ruin of his reputation, without even a chance of impoſing on the credulity of the public. Mr. B. had ſhewn that all po-

litical power is from God, the author of ſociety, and conferred by the miniſtry of the people; and that he has ſhewn on ſolid principles. He has alſo ſhewn Spiritual Powers are from J. C. founder of the Church, conferred by him immediately, not to King's or Magiſtrates, but to his Apoſtles, and from them derived to their ſucceſſors in office. This laſt queſtion the Ex. carefully avoids, and by a groſs miſrepreſentation diverts the attention of his readers to a different object.

As a compleat reply to Mr. B's aſſertion, that no temporal Prince as ſuch poſſeſſes any ſpiritual authority or juriſdiction, the Ex. ſays that aſſertion is contradicted by the law of the land, which declares the King ſupreme head of the Church of England. This compleat anſwer happens to be no anſwer at all, and leaves the queſtion *in ſtatu quo.* Mr. B's aſſertion was a logical inference from principles manifeſtly true, the force of which is not to be eluded. The writer does not cenſure the Ex. for adducing an act of parliament to ſilence reaſon; as every other evaſion was precluded. However he humbly preſumes that 'twould have been more philoſophical, more conſiſtent with the character of a ſcholar, to attempt a refutation of that inference by fair reaſoning. This might have been done by ſhewing that the principles aſſumed were not ſtrictly true, or that the inference was not logically deduced. To have recourſe to an act of parliament is ingenuouſly to acknowledge the inſufficiency of logical reaſoning, to invalidate a preſſing argument, the truth of which is obvious to the meaneſt capacity. To this may be added, that the act of parliament adduced is not a contradiction to the inference ſtated in Mr. B's Letter of Inſtruction, p. 29. The inference is thus ſtated: "it "follows of courſe that no temporal Prince *as ſuch* "can poſſeſs any ſpiritual powers, authority, or juriſ-"diction." The law of England declares the King head of the Church, not in his temporal, but in his eccleſiaſtical capacity. Mr. B. never denied the King to

be

be Supreme Head of the Church of England as by law eſtabliſhed, on the contrary he aſſerts it, and ſo do all well informed Catholics. From this principle, which the writer thinks inconteſtibly true, inferences are drawn, which require more logical powers than nature ſeems to have beſtowed on this Rev. Ex. and his powerful ally. The writer, whilſt he thus publicly declares, that in his opinion the King is ſole and ſupreme head of the Church of England as by law eſtabliſhed, begs leave to ſtate the reaſons why Catholics do not believe that any temporal Prince as ſuch is or can be head of the Catholic Church, or of any parcel, part, or portion of it. They ſay that, admitting a temporal Prince to poſſeſs a ſpiritual jurisdiction, it can extend no farther than his temporal juriſdiction, becauſe 'tis ſubordinate to it, and dependent on it; 'tis therefore of all neceſſity confined within the limits of his dominions: the Catholic Church is not confined within the dominions of any Prince: "the Saviour ordered his Apoſtles to teach "all nations,"—*Matt. ult.* "And it was ſaid to *Abra-*"*ham*, that in his ſeed all nations ſhould be bleſſed." *Gen.* xxvii. 4. 'Tis therefore evident as the ſun at mid-day that no temporal Prince as ſuch can be head of the Catholic Church: the head muſt have ſome authority over the members; beyond the limits of his dominions, no temporal prince has, or pretends to have, any authority whatſoever.—In the next place, Catholics ſay, that no temporal Prince as ſuch, can be head of any parcel, part, or portion of the Catholic Church. The reaſon which they offer is ſimple and concluſive—in the writers humble opinion, it bears no reply: the head and body, ſay they, compoſe the individual in the political and moral order as well as in the natural; an individual, as an entire and diſtinct whole, not a part or portion of any other: thus a head united to a leg, would be a monſtrous production, but not a part of another individual. If this reaſoning be not concluſive, the Rev. Ex. or his friend will eaſily detect the fallacy the

writer is not able to discover it, and wishes to be informed.

The Rev. Ex. at length engages in a religious controversy. His first statement is unfair and injudicious. Controversy does not seem to be his favourite study. *Non omnia possumus omnes*, but something must be said—*Scribimus indocti doctique poemata passim.*

"The spiritual powers," says he, *p.* 40. "which "Mr. B. denies to the King, he has transferred to the "Pope as successor of St. *Peter*." The Pope has therefore usurped the King's spiritual powers! not the powers which Parliament had conferred on the King surely? the Pope exercised these spiritual powers before there was a Parliament in England. Will the Rev. Ex. condescend to inform us by what means the Parliament was invested by these spiritual powers? was it by Act of Parliament? if so, the Parliament must have given itself a power, which it did not originally possess; this to a plain man has all the appearance of an unwarranted assumption. Was this spiritual power vested in the Parliament by J. C. the founder of the Christian Church, the source and fountain of all spiritual authority? Be that as it may, Mr. B. did not enquire who was St. *Peter's* successor, yet the writer is willing to admit that the Pope is in fact the rightful successor to that Apostle. And he ventures to assure the Rev. Ex. that Catholics are of that obstinate disposition, that nothing less than an Act of Parliament to deprive them of the first elements of common sense, can ever induce them to believe that any temporal Prince is successor to St. *Peter*, or that any human legislature can invest a Prince with the spiritual powers, which J. C. communicated to his Apostles, and by their ministry to their successors in office. He at the same time assures him that there are no men living, who have a higher respect for their Prince; a more deep sense of gratitude for the many signal favours, which his present Majesty has been graciously pleased to extend to them,

or

or who are more amenable to the laws, than the Catholics of the United Kingdom: their invariable maxim is, *to fear God, and honor the King.*

" Mr. B." ſays the Rev. Ex. p. 40. " has transferred the ſpiritual power from the King to the Pope, as " ſucceſſor to St. *Peter*, and with a ſuperlative omnipotence, which no civil government certainly ever " laid claim to." The writer wiſhes to know on what principle a civil government lays claim to a ſpiritual authority? *civil courts*, and *ſpiritual courts*, as well as the powers which they poſſeſſed and exerciſed, have been at all times, and in all civilized countries, contradiſtinguiſhed.—The heathens knew the diſtinction. Is this ſpiritual authority veſted in all civil Governments, or in ſome highly favoured Governments excluſively? if in ſome only, why not in others of the ſame form? whence the difference? does the Divan in Conſtantinople poſſeſs this ſpiritual authority? the Dey of Algiers, or the Emperor of Perſia? does the King of Spain, or the Emperor of Germany? it muſt be amongſt theſe latent powers which eſcaped the penetrating eye of St. *Paul.* We don't find that he or any of his fellow apoſtles applied to the civil Government for their miſſion; nor had any one of the primitive Paſtors recourſe to the Roman Senate for authority to preach and adminiſter the ſacraments.

The Rev. Mr. *Cochran* pretends, that to deny this ſpititual power to the crown, incurs the penalties of a *præmunire.* With ſubmiſſion to more intelligent men, the writer imagines that Mr. C. miſtakes the law: the non-conformiſts ſubſcribe the oath of ſupremacy, tho' they do not believe any ſpiritual authority to be veſted in the civil magiſtrate: this practice they found on Queen *Elizabeth's* explication of her injunctions to her viſitors: " That no more was intended than that her " Majeſty under God, had the ſovereignty and rule " over all perſons born in her realm, either eccleſiaſtic- " al or temporal, ſo as no foreign power had or ought

" to

" to have any authority over them."—*Neal, ch. 4. p.* 133.—" this," continues *Neal*, " They take to be the " natural right of all ſovereign princes in their domini- " ons, though there had been no ſtatute law for it." The Queen in her injunctions expreſsly declared, " that ſhe did not, nor would ſhe ever challenge any " authority and power to miniſter divine ſervice in the " church, nor would ſhe ever challenge any other au- " thority, than her predeceſſors, King *Henry* VIII. and " *Edward* VI. uſed."—*Neal, ibidem.* King *Henry* the VIIIth. in his letter to the convocation at York, aſ- ſures them, " that he claimed nothing more by the ſu- " premacy than what chriſtian Princes in the primitive " times aſſumed to themſelves in their own dominions." Chriſtian Princes at all times claimed the right of go- verning eccleſiaſtics as well as lay men; they never claimed any ſpiritual authority, and from theſe decla- rations of King *Henry* and Queen *Elizabeth*, it ap- pears that no ſuch claim is made in England. Thus the non-conformiſts underſtand it, and the writer is inclined to believe that 'tis underſtood in the ſame ſenſe by the King's judges. If that menacing writer be al- lowed to direct the magiſtrates, we may expect an ex- tenſive application of penal ſtatutes.

It's amuſing to hear that ſhe Pope, as *Melancton* calls her, *Elizabeth*, directing her eccleſiaſtical viſitors, and proteſting that ſhe did not intend to miniſter divine ſervice in perſon; perhaps ſhe had ſeen St. *Paul's* pro- hibition againſt the prattling of women in the church, and thought the omnipotence of Parliament could not change her ſex.

This Ex. ſtates that there are but two diſtinct claſ- ſes of Chriſtians, who differ from each other in eſ- ſential points, theſe are the Proteſtants and the Pa- piſts. Does this learned Exm. include amongſt Proteſtants the Neſtorians, the Eutychians, the mo- dern Greeks, the Janſeniſts? they are Chriſtians, and not Papiſts: for they moſt cordially hate the Pope:

Pope; they are not Proteſtants: for they celebrate Maſs and adminiſter all the other Sacraments; they believe in tranſubſtantiation, invoke the Saints and Angels, celebrate their feſtivals, obſerve the faſt of Lent and abſtain from fleſh on certain days; they offer up prayers and ſupplications for departed ſouls, and what's concluſive; they have ſolemnly condemned the doctrine contained in the confeſſion of *Auſburg*: when that confeſſion was ſent to the Patriarch of Conſtantinople, by the diſciples of the reformation for the approbation of the oriental Churches, they ſeverely cenſured it: in the 10th Chapter of that cenſure the Eaſtern prelates teach that doctrine of tranſubſtantiation as we Romaniſts do, "*multa in pac parte de vobis* (the Authors "of the confeſſion) *referuntur, quæ nobis nullo pacto* "*probari poſſunt: Eccleſiæ igitur ſanctæ illud ju-* "*dicium eſt, in ſacrâ Cænâ poſt Conſecratimens &* "*benedictionem, panem in illud ipſum Corpus J. C. vi-* "*num autem in illum Sanguinem virtute Spiritûs ſancti* "*tranſire ac permutari.*" The Ex. does not ſeem to have made church hiſtory any part of his ſtudies: he has perhaps adopted Doctor *Banniſter's* advice to the ſtudents of the Univerſity. This zealous Paſtor directs the ſtudents to read the heathen poets and philoſophers in the firſt place, and from the heathen poets he transfers his *young divine* to Doctor *Cudworth*, againſt *Materialiſm*, and Mr. *Jortin*, on eccleſiaſtical hiſtory; of the latter he ſays, that he's rather ſevere on the fathers: that is, on all the paſtors, whom Chriſt had given to his church from the Apoſtle's days, to the beginning of the ſeventeenth century; theſe men, ſo eminent for ſenſe, ſcience, and ſanctity, whom the Catholic world rever'd. 'Tis true they were not proteſtants; the Saxon monk had not yet enlightened the hemiſphere of religion; nor had the people yet learned to believe that apoſtates, regardleſs of vows and oaths, ſhaking off all the reſtraints of religion, and ſubſtituting a liberty, or rather licentiouſneſs, which would have done

done honor to the invention of the celebrated *Epicurus*, were the true disciples of that God who said, "if any man will come after me, let him deny himself, "take up his cross and follow me."—*Matt.* xvi. 24.—But yet the *Justin's*, the *Gregory's* the *Basils*, the *Chrysostoms*, the *Austins*, the *Jeromes*, the *Bernards*, afford some instruction; they taught the morality of the Gospel as well as the heathen poets and philosophers, of whom St. *Paul* draws not the most flattering picture in his epistle to the Romans, "being filled with all iniquity, malice, fornication, covetousness, wickedness, "full of envy, murder, contention, deceit, malignity, "whisperers, detracters, hateful to God, contumelious, "proud, haughty, inventors of evil things, disobedient "to parents, foolish, dissolute, without affection, without fidelity, without mercy."—*ch.* 1. 29. The first outlines of the picture are omitted; they are not less expressive of the genuine character of these authors in whose works our young divines are advised to study the morality of the Gospel. We find no such morality taught by the fathers whom *Jortin* censures: and to whom compared *Jortin* may pass for an ape. Why not refer the student to *Eusebius* of Cæsarea, the father of church history, who lived in the latter end of the third century, and beginning of the fourth? why not to *Theodoret* of Cyrus, whose history commenced with the heresy of *Arius*, and comprised the transactions of 105 years, as he himself says closing the work, and desiring the prayers of his readers as the reward of his labours? these writers were Papists, true; popery was then in fashion; there were no *Jortins*, nor *L'Enfants*; yet 'tis from these early writers we must learn the history of the Church in its first establishment and succeeding stages, not in the groundless conjectures of modern scribblers.

The writer refers the reader to these Greeks, passing unnoticed all later writers, both Greeks and Latins: the man must have his face double-plated

plated with braſs, who diſputes the univerſal eſtabliſhment of popery, as the Catholic doctrine is called from the days of *Theodoret*, to the beginning of the reformation, that is from the 5th century to the 16th.

The eſſential difference between Proteſtants and Papiſts, ſays the Ex. is this, " that all Proteſtants ac- " knowledge no other rule of faith and doctrine than " the Holy Scriptures." The antitheſis would have been, and Papiſts acknowledge ſome other rule of faith. Our Rev. Ex. on ſome principle of reaſoning not known to philoſophers, introduces the Pope, and under him the Popiſh Clergy, whom, ſays he, R. C. hold to be the repreſentatives of God and of J. C. and conſequently that their authority is equally a rule of faith and doctrine with the Holy Scriptures. The writer begs leave to aſſure this Rev. Ex. and his powerful ally, that when we Papiſts undertake to write, we previouſly endeavour to know ſomething of the ſubject matter; we never venture to miſrepreſent the principles of our opponents: the cauſe is defenceleſs which has recourſe to miſrepreſentation for ſupport. This Ex. miſrepreſents, not his own: for he does not ſeem to have any fixed principle, but the principles of the eſtabliſhed Church of England, of which thro' ſome ſtrange fatality, he profeſſes himſelf a member for this ſimple reaſon, that 'tis the eſtabliſhed Church, according to the principle which he lays down, he would believe in the inamiſſability of grace at Geneva, in conſubſtantiation at Wirtemberg, in tranſubſtantiation at Rome or Paris. The principles which he lends us Catholics will be examined hereafter.

Amongſt Proteſtants, ſays he, *p.* 42, " there is no " difference as to what is the general rule of faith and " doctrine," after a few lines he adds, " in chooſing " therefore between the different Proteſtant perſuaſions, " a man may conſult, his own fancy and caprice his ha- " bits or his prejudices."

Thus our Ex. introduces a new rule of faith, that is,

the fancy, the *caprice*, the *habit* or *prejudice* of each individual. If, as is pretended, the Scriptures be the ſole rule of faith, 'tis the ſenſe, not the ſound of the Scriptures, which muſt be taken for ſuch rule. To this the Rev. Ex. ſubſtitutes the *fancy*, the *caprice*, the *habit*, the *prejudice* of the reader. His faith therefore, is not founded on the Scriptures, but on his own fancied ſenſe of the Scriptures, which manifeſtly is not Scripture. Hence inſtead of a rule of faith, our Ex. aſſigns a manifeſt ſource of infidelity.

" The diſtinction of the different ſects of Proteſtants " ariſes merely upon the conſtruction of the ſame law, " which produces a difference of opinion either upon " the meer external forms of Religion, or upon meer " ſpeculative points of little importance, to the ſub- " ſtance of Chriſtianity." By this the Ex. admits that the Scriptures are full of obſcurity: for that law upon which conſtructions ariſe ſo widely different, as to form numerous ſects of Proteſtants, (they are his words) muſt be involved in obſcurity. It cannot therefore be a ſole rule of faith: for faith is not to be confounded with opinion. Faith is an aſſent of the underſtanding to revealed truths, founded on infallible authority, conſequently infallible and invariable, opinion proceeds from a preference given to a motive thought more probable than its oppoſite, and leaves the mind in a fluctuating ſtate. From the inquiſitive nature of man, opinions are continually changing, hence theſe variations in faith and doctrine, ſo numerous and conſpicuous in all the different ſects, who from the firſt eſtabliſhment of the Chriſtian Church, have at different times withdrawn their obedience from the Paſtors then in being, ſubſtituting their own opinions to the faith received from the Apoſtles, contrary to that expreſs command of the Apoſtle *Paul* to *Timothy*, " O *Timothy* " preſerve the depoſite, avoiding prophane novelties," or as it is in the original " *tas bebèlous kenophònias*," *not initiated empty ſounds*. *Ep.* 1. *Tim.* vi. 20.

That

That this Ex. misrepresents the avowed principles of the established Church of England, and of all other reformed Churches, is manifest beyond a contradiction: the act of separation of any reformed Church from all others, is not justifiable but in the supposition of some fundamental error taught in these Churches, with which they refuse to join in communion: for to make a secession or form a particular sect is, if we believe St. *Paul*, one of these crimes which exclude from Salvation: in his Epistle to the Galatians, the Apostle classes *secessions* and *sects*, *dichostasiai kai haireseis*, with *Idolatry* and *witchcraft*, and concludes that "they who do these things will not inherit the King-"dom of God." *Ch.* v. 20.

The Wr. imagines that 'twas on the authority of St. *Paul*, that the framers of the thirty nine articles composed the 18th, in these words "they also are to be "held accursed, that presume to say, that every man "shall be saved by the law or sect which he professes, "so that he be diligent to form his life according to "that law, and the light of nature: for Holy Scriptures "doth set out unto us only the name of J. C. whereby "men must be saved. 'Tis by faith, not by opinion, "that J. C. dwells in our hearts." *Eph.* iii. 7. "By faith "we are justified," *Rom.* v. 1. not by wavering opinion founded on fancy or prejudice.

The viii. article is not less explicit: in it we read, that the Creed called of *Athanasius*, ought thoroughly to be received and believed. It runs thus: "whoto-"ever will be saved before all things, it is necessary "that he hold the catholic faith, which faith except "every one do keep whole and undefiled, without "doubt he shall perish everlastingly." Catholic, that is universal faith, is set in contradistinction to particular opinions, and these who hold such opinions are excluded from Salvation.

Add to this, that in the synod of *Dort*, this doctrine was publicly purposed and not censured. "It remains

" to look out for remedies to this diſagreement in re-
" ligon."—the firſt— . . . . . another figment akin to this is, " that every (Chriſtian) *may be ſaved in his* " *own religion.* But this to one evil introduces ano-
" ther more nocent, namely, the certain ruin of thoſe " involved in error, inaſmuch as this opinion renders " the error incurable, as none will care to lay it down " or amend it."—*Ora. de Com. Reli. dissidiis.*

The Puritans ſeparated themſelves from the eſtabliſhed Church of England, not for a meer difference of opinion, but for an abſolute diſagreement in the doctrines of faith.—" The controverſy with the Puritans " had but a ſmall beginning, *viz.* the improving of the " Papiſts habits, and a few indifferent ceremonies, but it opened by degrees into a reformation of diſcipline, " which all confeſſed, was wanting at laſt, the *very* " *doctrines of faith were debated.*"—*Neal, ch.* 8. *p.* 594. " The violence of perſecution drove ſome of " them (Puritans) into the extreme of *Browniſm*, " which divided the Puritans, and gave riſe to a new " controverſy concerning the neceſſity of a ſeparation " from the eſtabliſhed Church."—*ibid p.* 595.

In a word, the Puritans never would have ſeparated themſelves from the eſtabliſhed Church of England, if they did not think ſome doctrines in that Church inconſiſtent with faith, and conſequently with ſalvation; nor would the Lutherans have ſeparated themſelves from the Catholic Church, which in *Luther's* early days was the eſtabliſhed Church in all the kingdoms and ſtates of Europe, but under pretence of fundamental errors being taught in that Church, ſo true it is that this alone can juſtify the ſeparation of any reformed Church from all other Churches.

When then our Ex. thus extends ſalvation indiſtinctly and indiſcriminately to all diſcriptions of Proteſtants, he ſubſtitutes his private opinion to the authentic doctrine of the eſtabliſhed Church, which expreſsly excludes from the ordinary poſſibility of ſalvation all who

are

are not of her communion; and in this ſhe agrees with all churches which have an eſtabliſhed code of doctrine.

The extraordinary poſſibility of ſalvation to theſe who are not actually of her communion, is admitted by the R. C. Church: 'tis a Catholic maxim, that they, who ſeek the truth, diſpoſed to believe it if clearly propoſed, are not numbered amongſt ſectaries, though they may be actually in the public communion of ſome ſeparate Church. 'Tis alſo certain that invincible neceſſity, and invincible ignorance, excuſe even fundamental errors; and St. *Thomas* of Aquin, from a decorous fitneſs of divine mercy, extends this extraordinary poſſibility of ſalvation even to infidels.

From the remarkable inaccuracy of his ſtatements, it appears that this Rev. Ex. is himſelf groſsly deceived, or that he intentionally deceives his readers: "there is no denomination of Proteſtants who do not "candidly admit that ſalvation may be obtained in any "other Proteſtant ſect." ſays he. This muſt be underſtood of the ordinary poſſibility of ſalvation admitted by the code of doctrine in that ſect, which is not only incorrect, but a glaring abſurdity. Why ſo? becauſe that ſect would thereby condemn itſelf of the guilt of ſchiſm without cauſe, and exclude itſelf and all its members from ſalvation, according to the doctrine of St. *Paul.*

To this our Rev. Ex. adds a greater inaccuracy, which may proceed from a total ignorance of that doctrine which he pretends to examine:—"'tis one of the "Popiſh doctrines," ſays he, "that ſalvation cannot "be obtained out of the pale of the Romiſh Church." If he had been converſant with our doctrine, and poſſeſſed of a little candour, he would have ſtated it as we do, thus—'tis an article of Catholic doctrine, "that "without the pale of the Church of Chriſt there is no "ſalvation." A truth manifeſt on the ſimple expoſition; which no Chriſtian ever denied. We add that the

the Catholic Church, in communion with the See of Rome, acknowledging the ſpiritual juriſdiction of St. *Peter* in his ſucceſſor, is that viſible Church, which Chriſt inſtituted; and that in it excluſively is found the *ordinary possibility* of ſalvation: becauſe in it are found excluſively the ordinary means for attaining that end, that is a lawful ſucceſſion of Paſtors teaching and adminiſtering the ſacraments according to the expreſs promiſe of J. C. "behold all power is given to me . . . "go teach all nations baptizing them . . . . . I am "with you till the conſummation."—*Matth. ult.*

We don't pretend to confine the mercy of J. C. to the ordinary means thus inſtituted, and hence we admit an *extraordinary possibility* of ſalvation to thoſe, who are not publicly profeſſed members of Chriſt's viſible Church; whoſe errors may be excuſed by invincible neceſſity, or invincible ignorance; we extend this extraordinary poſſibility of ſalvation yet farther, even to theſe, who have obſtinately perſevered in error without the excuſe of invincible ignorance or invincible neceſſity: they may be enlightened by ſome extraordinary grace in their dying moments, and ſincerely deſire to die in the communion of Chriſt's Church, which we devoutly hope is the caſe of thouſands of our diſſenting brethren. Hence we never preſume to judge theſe, who die in the public communion of any church ſeparate from ours: becauſe we know that the mercy and power of J. C. are not confined to ordinary means, and by ſome extraordinary grace he may have placed amongſt his elect thoſe whom we might raſhly condemn. If it be aſked why we don't offer public prayers for the deceaſed of diſſenting communions? to this we reply, that our prayers are offered in general for all, who die in the grace of Jeſus Chriſt; we don't offer prayers in particular for any deceaſed member of a diſſenting communion, in order to deter the faithful from a neglect of the ordinary means of ſalvation.

If this Rev. Ex. could diveſt himſelf of that party ſpirit,

ſpirit, which ſo ſtrongly characterize the whole of his pretended examination—he would admit that we Catholics are more liberal to all deſcriptions of Proteſtants than they are to us, or to each other.

Tillotſon, celebrated for the ſolid lead of his voluminous productions, in his XIth Sermon, on the hazard of being ſaved in the Church of Rome, after admitting that Papiſts, under the influence of prejudice or invincible ignorance upon *general repentance*, might find mercy, " adds, " but for thoſe, who had the opportu-" nities of coming to the knowledge of truth, if they " continue, in the errors of that church, or apoſtatize " from the truth, I think their condition ſo far from " being ſafe, that there muſt be extraordinary favour-" able circumſtances in their caſe, to give a man hope " of their ſalvation." Thus one of the great lights of the eſtabliſhed Church excludes by wholeſale from the ordinary poſſibility of ſalvation, admitting merely a diſtant poſſibility; and as the errors with which he accuſes Papiſts are common to Greeks, Syrians, Arabs, Perſians, Copts, Armenians, Chriſtians of Saint *Thomas*, to the whole Chriſtian world, then, ſince, and eight hundred years before, this new luminary ſends them all in bulk to the lower regions. The reader muſt not imagine that *Tillotſon's* opinion was not warranted by the authentic code of the eſtabliſhed doctrine: the 35th Art. declares that the Book of *Homilies* contains ſound doctrine; in that gainſt the peril of idolatry we read: " the laity and Clergy learned " and unlearned of all ages, ſects, and degrees, of men, " women, and children, of whole Chriſtendom, have " been at once drowned in abominable and damnable " idolatry, and that by the ſpace of 800 years and " more, to the deſtruction and ſubverſion of all good " religion univerſally." As idolatry is an actual ſin, 'tis not eaſy to conceive how the children were guilty of it. Perhaps the Homily, on the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, may ſerve as a corrective to this univerſally damning

ning *Homily*. In the latter we read, " that the Ho-
" ly Ghoſt, the Spirit of truth, has been, and will be,
" always preſent with the Church, governing and di-
" recting to the world's end, ſo that it never has wanted,
" nor ever will want, while the world endures, pure
" and ſound doctrine—the ſacraments miniſtered ac-
" cording to Chriſt's inſtitution, and the right uſe of
" eccleſiaſtical diſcipline." The writer does not undertake to reconcile contradictions: Nature has not bleſſed him with an underſtanding capable of conceiving how ſound and pure doctrine is reconcileable with abominable and damnable idolatry. Nor does he rightly conceive how the Holy Ghoſt has been governing and directing a Church immerſed in abominable idolatry.

Let us now revert to the rule of faith propoſed by this Ex. " Proteſtants," ſays he, " acknowledge no o-
" ther rule of faith and doctrine than the Holy Scrip-
" tures." The writer is willing to admit, that Proteſtants acknowledge no other rule of faith; but the Rev. Ex. muſt alſo admit, that in theory, the Scriptures cannot be a ſole rule of faith; that in practice they are not, have not been, nor ever will be. This poſition which lays the ax to the root, is nearly an intuitive truth. A ſole rule of faith muſt extend to every truth which is of faith. For any article of doctrine to which it does not extend, recourſe muſt be had to ſome other rule. The Rev. Ex. will have the modeſty to admit, there are ſome doctrinal truths which are not contained in the Scriptures: the firſt of theſe is, that the Scriptures themſelves are divinely inſpired, and tranſmitted to us without interpolation or corruption. In no book of the Scripture do we find that theſe books which we call canonical were divinely inſpired, and if we did, the difficulty would be only tranſferred to itſelf: the queſtion would immediately recur—on what authority do we believe that this book, which makes the Scriptures divinely inſpired, was itſelf

ſelf divinely inſpired. This argument is from the nature of things inſoluble, and precludes even the poſſibility of evaſion: in vain this Rev. Ex. may refer to the private ſpirit, to a certain ſenſation, a certain taſte, a certain ſomething indiſcribable. All theſe certain things, are moſt certainly no part of the Scriptures, and by having recourſe to them, he muſt admit that the Scriptures are not his ſole rule of faith. To this the writer adds that in practice the Scriptures are not the rule of proteſtant faith; the aſſertion he thinks incontrovertibly true, and is convinced that every unprejudiced Proteſtant will admit it. Will it be denied that many Proteſtants are incapable of reading the Scriptures? many incapable of inveſtigating the intended ſenſe of the ſacred writers? many who are Proteſtants of one deſcription in preference to all others, but becauſe their parents are of that particular denomination? and, to cloſe with a peremptory reaſon, which bears no reply, an immenſe majority, who are Proteſtants before they read a line of the Scriptures? will any man preſume to affirm that men, who cannot read the Scriptures, men, who do not read the Scriptures, men, who if they did read, cannot underſtand the Scriptures, or finally men, who are already Proteſtants before they read the Scriptures, take the Scriptures for their ſole rule of faith? All reaſoning is loſt upon the man who would advance ſo groſs an abſurdity.

Let us hear the ſentiments of ſome Proteſtant divines: for they too ſpeak truth when not forced by untenable principles to affirm inconſiſtencies. Doctor *Fern*, an eminent divine, tells us, "that the Scripture "contains all things of themſelves neceſſary to be be- "lieved or done to ſalvation, not expreſsly and in ſo "many words, but either ſo, or elſe deducible thence "by evident and ſufficient conſequence."—*Sect.* 22. and he afterwards adds, "that things thus neceſſary "are not deducible, all by every one, that reads; but "it is enough if done by the Paſtors, and guides, which

" God appointed in his Church to that purpoſe, uſing " the means, that are needful to that purpoſe, ſuch as is " attention, and diligence in ſearch of the Scriptures, " collation of places, and obſerving the connections, " alſo ſincerity and impartiality in the collation or de- " ductions, which they make, alſo prayer and devo- " tion in the work."—*Sect.* 26. This Doctor refers the unlearned Proteſtant, not to the Scriptures, but to the Paſtors and guides, whom God has appointed in his Church, and not indiſcriminately to all, but to ſuch as uſe diligence and attention in ſearching the Scriptures, who collate paſſages, obſerve connections with ſincerity and impartiality, and who add prayer and devotion. The Doctor ought to have given the unlearned Proteſtant ſome unerring rule to diſtinguiſh the devout and diligent Paſtors from others, who aſſume the appearance. This unerring rule, the Doctor, for very obvious reaſons, has not given; he has therefore left the unlearned Proteſtant in a ſtate of anxious ſuſpence. To paſs unnoticed that grounleſs aſſertion that all things neceſſary to be believed are contained in the Scriptures or deducible from them; for 'tis abſolutely neceſſary to believe the Scriptures divinely inſpired, and this truth is neither contained in Scripture nor deducible from it by any rule of reaſoning as yet known to the world; there are many other truths of religion not contained in the Scriptures, and if they were by diſtant implication, the Doctor candidly admits that they are not deducicle by a great majority of Proteſtants.

Let us hear ſome other teachers of the reformation. Mr. *Jurieu*, a Proteſtant divine of great authority, preſſed by ſome leading queſtions ſuch as theſe: if the Scripture be the ſole rule of faith is it neceſſary to read all the canonical books? is it ſufficient to have read one or more of them? if ſo, which are the books of Scripture in which all the revealed truths of religion are contained? theſe queſtions were not eaſily ſolved; but

but a moſt unlucky one ſucceeded, that is, what is his rule of faith, who has neither read the Scriptures nor heard them read, who juſt begins to read them? is he an infidel? is he a Chriſtian? if a Chriſtian the Scripture which he neither read nor heard read was not his rule of faith. This was a moſt embarraſſing queſtion: it left no ſubterfuge, no evaſion. *Jurieu's* laſt effort to extricate himſelf from this inſoluble difficulty, has ſapped the very foundation of the much boaſted reformation: "the Chriſtian doctrine;" ſays he, "taken in "its entire makes itſelf felt, *ſe fait ſentir:* to make "an act of faith on the Scripture 'tis not neceſſary to "have read it; 'tis ſufficient to have read a ſummary "of the Chriſtian doctrine, without entering into a "detail: the people, who have not the Holy Scripture "may notwithſtanding be good Chriſtians. The doc-"trine of the Goſpel makes the ſimple feel its divinity "independently on the books in which it is contained, "though this doctrine be mixed with uſeleſs things, "*(inutilités,)* and ſome things not divine, yet the pure "and heavenly doctrine mixed will make itſelf felt. "Conſcience will taſte the truth, and afterwards, the "believer will believe that ſuch a book is canonical "becauſe there are truths in it which touch him in a "word, the faith is felt as heat near a fire, as ſweet-"neſs or bitterneſs in eating." *ibid. p.* 453, *& ſeq.* On this principle of *Jurieu*, the Mahometan believes the Alcoran canonical, and children believe the fairy tales, there are in them many things which tickle their fancy. This however is *Jurieu's* laſt ſhift to extricate himſelf from that embarraſſing difficulty in which the fundamental principle of the pretended reformation involved him. "All things are to be examined, regula-"ted, and reformed according to the Scripture."—*5th Article.—Conf. of Faith.*

Mr. *Claude*, not leſs celebrated than *Jurieu*, finding it impoſſible to give a ſatisfactory anſwer to theſe embarraſſing queſtions which had forced *Jurieu* to ſhift

his ground from the Scripture, to that imaginary impreſſion which revealed truths make on the expoſition, took refuge in the ſame labyrinth ;—*Def. de la Re. 2 p. C. 9. p. 296, & Seq.*—but this, beſides giving up the fundamental principle of the reformation, only encreaſed his embarraſſment: for the myſterious truths of religion not being of the number of theſe, which are called *intuitive*, becauſe they are immediately conceived when propoſed, as the whole is greater than a part, muſt be propoſed by ſome authority, or they can make no impreſſion at all, and the authority on which theſe truths are propoſed muſt be infallible ; if not, the aſſent cannot be infallible for the aſſent to truth cannot be more infallible than the authority on which 'tis founded; hence Meſſrs. *Jurieu* and *Claude*, muſt of all neceſſity admit ſome infallible authority on earth beſides the Scriptures; which at one ſtroke levels the whole fabric of this boaſted reformation with the duſt.

In his next edition 'tis hoped that this Rev. Ex. will aſſign ſome other rule of faith: ſince 'tis evident to the meaneſt capacity, that the Scriptures neither are nor can be a ſufficient rule. What advantage then reſults from the poſſeſſion of the Scriptures? the greateſt poſſible: 'tis aſſigned by St. *Paul*; every writing di- " vinely inſpired is uſeful to teach, to argue, to inſtruct, " to correct in juſtice, that the man of God may be " entire perfectly prepared for every good work."— 2 *Tim.* iii. 16 & 17.—Theſe were the ends for which the Scriptures were written, and given to the Church, already compoſed of Paſtors teaching and adminiſtering ſacraments, and of ſimple faithful, who were taught by their Paſtors. Of theſe not one found the faith, which he then believed and profeſſed, in the Scriptures: for this peremptory reaſon they were not yet written. The faithful received the faith from their Paſtors, deputed to announce it by theſe whom Chriſt had authorized, and from them alſo they received the Scriptures, when written; and the intended ſenſe of the

the inſpired writers. So true it is, as St. *Paul* ſays, that " faith is from hearing,"—*Rom.* x. 17.—and that 'tis from the Paſtors lawfully deputed that we are to hear it: " how will they preach," ſays the Apoſtle, " if they be not ſent?" *ibid.* hence in his epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, iv. 11. he ſays: " He (J. C.) gave ſome " Apoſtles, ſome Prophets, ſome Evangeliſts, ſome Paſ- " tors and teachers for the coagmentation of the Saints " to the work of the miniſtry, to the edification of the " body of Chriſt . . . . . that we may not be whirl- " ed about by every wind of doctrine." The Apoſtle informs us, in language as ſtrong and as plain as words can expreſs it. That the Paſtors given by J. C. are the lawful teachers, who by their miniſtry are to collect into one body, all the members of J. C; from them therefore, we are to receive the faith; elſewhere we ſeek it in vain. The words of the Apoſtle are ſtrongly expreſſive of the unity of Chriſt's Church: " *pros* " *katartiſmon tòn agiòn.*" The Greek verb *katertiſo* ſignifies to replace the diſlocated members of the body—this office, the Apoſtle aſſigns to the Paſtors and teachers.

From this ſole rule of our Ex's. faith, let us revert to that rule of faith, which he has invented for our uſe. 'Tis ſtrange that theſe Gentlemen, will not permit us to know the doctrine, which is taught in our own Schools and Churches; that in the face of Reclamation, Truth and Conviction, they continue to ſtate doctrinal deciſions for us, of which we do not believe a ſyllable: R. C. ſays, the Ex. p. 41. " hold the Pope, " and under him the popiſh Clergy, to be the repreſenta- " tives of God and of J. Chriſt." Does this Rev. Ex. believe the divinity of J. C.? if ſo, why ſet J. Chriſt in contradiſtinction to God, in the ſame phraſe? this is the language of *Arius*, and his diſciples. The Apoſtles, and in imitation of the Apoſtles. Catholic writers ſay, God the Father and J. Chriſt, or God the Father of our Lord J. Chriſt, or ſome ſuch expreſſion, ſetting

ſetting the Father in contradiſtinction to the Son, whether expreſſed or underſtood; but not God in contradiſtinction to J. Chriſt; that mode of ſpeaking is offenſive to the proteſtant, as well as the Catholic Ear.

Catholics believe St. *Peter* to have been appointed by J. C. to feed his flock on earth, and they believe it on the moſt unerring authority, that is, on the faith of J. Chriſt himſelf, who ſaid to him "feed my lambs, "rule my ſheep." *John* xxi. And in that ſenſe they believe *Peter*, and his ſucceſſors to repreſent J. Chriſt, as an Ambaſſador repreſents his Maſter. St. *Paul*, believed it and aſſerted it of himſelf and his fellow Apoſtles: "*úper Chriſtou oun preſbuomen òs tou Theou* "*paraſkalountos diemòn.* We are therefore Ambaſſa- "dors for Chriſt, God as it were exhorting by us." 2 *Cor.* v. 20. And in his Epiſtle to the Epheſians, he ſays "*úper óu preſbuò*" "for whom I am Ambaſſa- "dor." vi. 20.

From the principle which the Ex. ſtates for us, according to his own fancy, he draws a more fanciful concluſion. That is, "that the authority of the Pope "and popiſh Clergy is equally a rule of faith and doc- "trine with the holy Scriptures, and equally binding "upon the conſciences of men, nay, that the Scrip- "tures themſelves are to be underſtood only in that "ſenſe, which theRomiſh Church thinks proper to give "them." A man would imagine that this Ex. had been a profeſſor of Theology in one of our Univerſities, he ſtates our doctrine with ſuch preciſion. There is a trifling inaccuracy; it eſcaped him perhaps thro' inadvertence: the ſtatement is ſimply falſe. We Catholics know no authority equal to the word of God; but we know no difference between the word of God ſpoken by the Apoſtles, and the ſame word written; we have the ſame confidence in their tongues, that we have in their pens, nor did the Apoſtles themſelves know any ſuch difference: they were not ſent to write but to preach and baptiſe: read their commiſſion in the

laſt

laſt chapter of St. *Matthew*. And many of them never wrote a line. Was their doctrine the leſs true? was it of leſs authority? were they who rejected their doctrine the leſs criminal, leſs accountable to the divine juſtice? did not St. *Paul*, ſtrictly command the Theſſalonians to hold faſt the *oral traditions* "*paradoſeis*" 2 *Th.* ii. 15. which they had learnt whether by word *dia logou* or by letter "*dia Epiſtolés*" the Apoſtle, therefore thought the word of God received by oral tradition was of equal authority with the written word. But how are we to know that the doctrine received by oral tradition is the word of God? by the very ſame rule and the ſame means by which we know that the written word is the word of God, that is, by the teſtimony of the Catholic Church, ſpeaking by her Paſtors, in whoſe hands J. Chriſt, depoſited both the written, and unwritten word, and whoſe teſtimony is of equal weight in favour of the one as of the other. In this appears his providential care of his Church, that is of all his children to the end of time, in giving them a rule of faith eaſy in practice, infallible, and univerſal, literally fulfilling the prophecy of *Iſais*, who ſpeaking of the flouriſhing ſtate of Chriſt's Church, or Spiritual Kingdom, ſays, "And a high way ſhall be there, and "a way, and it ſhall be called the way of holineſs, the "unclean ſhall not paſs over it: but it will be for "thoſe, the way-faring men though fools ſhall not "error therein." The Proteſtant verſion now cited, though not very correct, gives nearly the ſenſe of the original text, "*ve hajah ſham maſeloul va derek va de-*"*rick ha codeſh jicarat lah lo jahaberenou tamé, ve hou*"*lamou holek derek ve hevilim lo jith hou.*" The way which the prophet deſcribes is ſuch that even the moſt ignorant cannot ſtray in it: 'tis not neceſſary to remark that the way of holineſs in the Scriptures ſignifies a knowledge of the divine law, and to walk in the way of holineſs is to obſerve the precepts of the law, which muſt lead to holineſs. Will the Rev. Ex. pretend

that

that a knowledge of all the precepts of the divine law is ſo eaſily diſcovered in the Scriptures, that even the moſt ſtupid cannot miſtake it? if ſo, whence this variety of opinions on the ſenſe of certain texts? whence theſe endleſs controverſies, not amongſt the unlearned, who are incapable of controverſial diſcuſſion, but amongſt the learned themſelves? with what propriety can that be called an "*holek derek*," a common high way, in which the unwiſe ſhall not wander *evilim jo jitheou*, which the learned themſelves cannot find without the greateſt difficulty?

St *Auſtin*, juſtly remarks that to believe authority is a great abridgement and no labour. The Catholic finds his faith in the ſame Church, where he finds the Scriptures, and there alſo he finds the genuine ſenſe of the Scriptures, which is an eſſential part of the word of God; a part of that depoſite of faith which the Apoſtles committed to the ſubordinate Paſtors, whom they had appointed to govern their reſpective portions of the one flock of J. Chriſt, directing them to commit this depoſite in the ſame manner to faithful men capable of inſtructing others: "Thou my ſon be "ſtrengthened in the grace of J. Chriſt, and theſe "things which you heard from me amongſt many wit-"neſſes, the ſame commit *tauta parathou* to faithful "men capable of inſtructing others."—2 *Tim.* ii. In this authentic inſtruction of the Apoſtle to his diſciple *Timothy*, whom he had ordained Biſhop of Epheſus, we have diſtinctly explained the manner in which the depoſite, that is the doctrine and diſcipline of the Apoſtles, was delivered to their diſciples, and by them tranſmitted to us through their ſucceſſors from generation to generation. In the word of God tranſmitted to us we find the intended ſenſe of obſcure paſſages "which "the unlearned and the unſettled wreſt to their own "perdition," as we learn from St. *Peter* ſpeaking of St. *Paul's* epiſtles, in which there are ſome things difficult to be underſtood, "*dus noćta.*"—2 *Pet.* iii. 16.

Thus

Thus we know the manner of adminiſtering the ſacraments; of inſtituting the miniſters of the Church; of their different orders; the obligation of ſanctifying the firſt day of the week *Sunday*, not the laſt *Saturday*, as ordered in the Scriptures, which ordinance of the Old Teſtament is no where cancelled in the New; the neceſſity of baptizing infants; of offering up prayers and ſupplications for the repoſe of departed ſouls.

On oral tradition the divinity of J. Chriſt was always believed and publicly profeſſed in the Church, on this principle the Arian hereſy was condemned in the great Council of Nice: there is no text in Scripture, however expreſſive of the divinity of J. Chriſt, which the Arians did not elude by ingenious and artful explications; but the public faith of the Church, founded on the oral tradition of the Apoſtles, was not to be evaded. The Apoſtles explained their doctrine in their public lectures, all difficulties and ambiguities were removed, and the faithful diſtinctly underſtood, the intended ſenſe of their doctrine. On this ſimple principle, have all innovations from the very eſtabliſhment of the Church been condemned. However great the numbers, who may have been ſeduced by any innovator or pretended reformer, we always return to the day on which he firſt began to introduce his new opinion; and we tell him, this new doctrine was not taught yeſterday in any one Church of the whole Chriſtian world, you therefore are the inventor of it; 'tis no part of the faith delivered to the Saints, which St. *Jude*, recommends to the faithful "*tê âpax paradotheiſêi tois "âgiois piſteî*" the faith once delivered by oral tradition as the Greek terms ſignifies to the Saints. *Jude* i. 'Tis no part of that depoſite of faith which St. *Paul* committed to *Timothy*, in preſence of many witneſſes. The writer gives an inſtance in two articles of Catholic doctrine rejected by all deſcriptions of Proteſtants, that is the doctrine of purgatory and tranſubſtantation; the motives for rejecting theſe tenets

have been already aſſigned. 'Tis undeniably true that theſe doctrines were believed and taught ; that prayers were offered up for ſuffering ſouls ; and that in the public ſacrifice of the Maſs, J. Chriſt was believed to be really preſent, and offered up to his eternal father under the appearances of bread and wine as a propitiatory ſacrifice, for the living and the dead in all Churches of the whole Chriſtian world, the day before *Martin Luther* commenced his reforming trade ; 'tis alſo true that he himſelf believed theſe doctrines, and that he and his anceſtors for many generations were baptiſed in that Church, which believed and taught them doctrines, whence it muſt be inferred that the novelties, which he introduced, compoſed no part of that depoſite of faith tranſmitted by the Apoſtles thro' their lawful ſucceſſors down to us ; they were therefore of his own invention. His appeal to the Scriptures is vain : did *Martin Luther*, a Saxon Monk, whoſe works yet extant ſpeak the author a ſcurrilous buffoon, underſtand the Scriptures better than the *Auſtins*, the *Jeroms*, the *Gregorys*, *Greeks* and *Latins* ; in a word better than the whole Chriſtian World ? the ſuppoſition ſurpaſſes abſurdity. But you'll ſay they might have miſtaken the ſenſe of the Scriptures. To this the reply is ſimple : 'tis infinitely more probable that *Luther* miſtook the ſenſe, or rather perverted it, in order to ſupport a cauſe in which the ſpirit of pride had engaged him, and would not permit him to retract. 'Tis from the Apoſtles that their immediate ſucceſſors in the miniſtry received the Scriptures, and with the Scriptures, the genuine ſenſe of the ſacred writers, on this genuine ſenſe, not the fancied ſenſe of innovators, was the practice of the Church founded, and formed. If the Apoſtles had told their ſucceſſors, or the different ſubordinate Paſtors, whom they had appointed to feed their reſpective portions of the flock, that the words of inſtitution " *this is my Body, this is my blood*," were to be underſtood in a figurative ſenſe, and that the ſacramental

eramental ſpecies contained nothing more than bread and wine, as a ſimple memorial, there never would have been an altar erected, nor would the tremendous ſacrifice of Chriſt's Body, have been offered as a propitiation for the living and the dead. The univerſal practice of all Chriſtian Churches in all ages invariably the ſame before the reformation, ſhews the ſenſe in which the Apoſtles underſtood the words of inſtitution, and the ſenſe in which they taught them, that is, the plain, obvious, and literal ſenſe, as they were always underſtood in the Chriſtian Church.

The ſame obſervation is applicable to the doctrine of purgatory: prayers and ſacrifices were offered for the dead in the Jewiſh diſpenſation: of this we have authentic evidence in the book of the *Maccabees*, which, whether canonical or not, is at leaſt a hiſtory written by a well informed Jew, who knew the practice of the Jewiſh Church. St. *Auſtin* ſays, that "the Chriſtian "Church holds theſe books canonical, and though, "ſays he, this ſhould not be read in the old Scriptures, "the authority of the univerſal Church is manifeſt, "where, in the prayers which are offered, at the altar, "the commendation of the dead has its place."—*Lib. de Curá pro. mor. Cap.* 2.—Two ages before him *Tertullien* had ſaid, "We make offerings for the dead, "if you aſk the reaſon, tradition is given as a prece"dent, cuſtom obſerves it and faith preſerves it."—*Lib. de Cor. Mi.*—On this univerſal practice St. *Chryſoſtome* aſſerts in his 69th Homily to the people, "that theſe things were not raſhly inſtituted by the "Apoſtles, that in the tremendous myſteries (Maſs) "there ſhould be a commemoration of the dead." So true it is that in the practice of the Church, founded by the Apoſtles, the genuine ſenſe of the doctrine, which they taught is to be found; not in the wild ſpeculations of apoſtate Monks, who, regardleſs of vows and oaths, and thus abandoned to a reprobate ſenſe, pretend to find in the Scriptures a ſenſe which

was never intended by the ſacred writers; but which may ſerve as a maſk to conceal the apoſtacy and profligacy of theſe new teachers.

But finally, to ſay, that tradition is of equal authority with the written word of God, is it not to make the authority of men equal to that of God? No, but to make the unwritten word of God of equal authority with his written word, which is a manifeſt truth: when God promiſed *Abraham* that all nations ſhould be bleſſed in his ſeed, and ordered him and all his deſcendants to be circumciſed, was the promiſe of leſs force or the obligation of obſerving the ceremony of the circumciſion leſs rigorous, before *Moſes* had written it in the book of *Geneſis* ſome 430 years after? the Ex. will not venture to aſſert that *Iſaac*, *Jacob*, *Joſeph*, and many others were not faithful men; yet on the authority of the unwritten word tranſmitted by oral tradition, they believed, and on the ſame authority they obſerved the law, as did *Moſes* himſelf before he was appointed to conduct the Jewiſh people—and, to deſcend to the Chriſtian Church, in its firſt formation, and many years after, the faith of the primitive Chriſtians in J. Chriſt was not found in the New Teſtament: 'Twas not yet written, nor was the morality of the Goſpel explained in the Epiſtles of St. *Paul* before he wrote them. The people therefore believed in J. Chriſt, and obſerved his law on the authority of the unwritten word received by oral tradition.

To pretend that we Catholics think the authority of the Church equal to that of the Scriptures is a meer artifice to impoſe on the credulity of the uninformed and divert their attention from the real ſtate of the controverſy, which is this, whether the authority of the Catholic Church be ſuperior to that of an unqualified individual? or in other words, whether the Paſtors of the Catholic Church aſſembled in Council, or diſperſed, and communicating to each other the immemorial practice and doctrine of their reſpective Churches, underſtand

underſtand the Scriptures better than a Cobler on his bulk. We Catholics think the Paſtors of the Church the more competent judges of the intended ſenſe of the inſpired writings. We think the Cobler might modeſtly ſubmit his judgment to their deciſion—and in this we are juſtified by the rules of common ſenſe. If the Cobler appeals to the authority of his miniſter, we reply that his miniſter pretends to no authority but muſt refer him to the Scripture, whether he can read it or not, and leaves him to ſhift for himſelf; and if his miniſter ſhould aſſume any authority, we tell him that ſome thouſands of Biſhops now living, and tens of thouſands who are now no more, many of whom were men eminent for ſcience and ſanctity, as ſuch revered by the world, condemn the pretended authority of his miniſter, and if he prefers the authority of one man of little note, intereſted in his own cauſe, to that of ſo many thouſands totally diſintereſted, becauſe they lived before the controverſy began;—we ſay that he acts againſt the principles of common ſenſe, and is not only criminal, but inexcuſable in hs error.

Let us now ſubſtitute to the Cobler his miniſter, whom we ſhall ſuppoſe a *Jortin* or a *Palæologus*, who, profeſſedly deſpiſe Popes and Councils, Doctors and Prelates, ancient and modern; he will admit no other rule of faith but the Scriptures, in them excluſively he muſt find by his own induſtry all that he is to believe, and all that he is to do in order to ſalvation. To this man of ſcience, this *Jortin* or *Cochran* we ſimply reply that 'tis not true, that he can find in the Scriptures all that he is to believe: for he muſt believe that the Goſpel of St. *Matthew* is a canonical book, and he will not find it in the Scriptures; nor will he find in the Scriptures that the Greek verſion of that goſpel, the author of which is not known, is authentic; nor can he with all his ſcience declare it authentic: becauſe the Hebraic original is loſt; nor can he by any human induſtry diſcover all the books which have been canonical,

many

many of them are irrecoverably loſt. *Adam Contzen* proves that twenty books of the Scripture are loſt. 2. 4. *Ch.* 8.—Thus for Ex. " it is ſaid in the book of the " wars of the Lord."—*Numb.* xxi. 14.—This book is loſt, and " *Solomon* ſpoke three thouſand proverbs and " five."—1ſt *Kings* iv. 32. Where are they? " Now " the reſt of the acts of *Solomon*, firſt and laſt are they " not written in the book of *Nathan* the prophet, and " in the prophecy of *Abijah*, and in the viſion of *Id-* " *do*."—2 *Chr.* ix. 29. The firſt of *Chronicles* terminated in theſe words, " Now the Acts of *David*, the king " firſt and laſt, behold be they not written in the book " of *Samuel* the ſeer, and in the book of *Nathan* the Pro- " phet, and in the book of *Gad* the ſeer." All theſe books are conſigned to oblivion; two of St. *Paul's* Epiſtles ſhared the ſame fate, one to the *Laodicians*, which in his laſt Epiſtle to the *Colloſſians* he ordered to be read in that Church, and one which he mentions in his firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, " I wrote to you an Epiſ- " tle," v. 9. This Epiſtle does not appear; St. *Mat-* *thew* cites a whole quotation from *Jeremias*, which is not in his book, as tranſmitted to us. There is ſome- thing ſimilar to it in the book of *Zacharias*; but it muſt have been then in the book of *Jeremias*, or St. *Matthew* would not have cited it, that may be the rea- ſon why the Jews retrenched it; the ſame Evangeliſt had ſaid, " it was ſpoken by the prophets, he ſhall be " called a Nazarean."—ii. 23.

Chryſoſtme writing on this text, " ſays many of the " prophetical monuments have periſhed: for the Jews " being careleſs and not only careleſs, but impious, they " have careleſsly loſt ſome of theſe monuments, others " they have partly burned, partly torn to pieces." *Homi.* 9th.

St. *Juſtin* arguing againſt *Tryphon*, ſhews that the Jews did make away with many books of the old Teſtament, leaſt it ſhould appear conſiſtent with the new. 'Tis not from the Jews that the Catholic Church

received

received the faith of J. Chriſt, and with the faith the Scriptures ; but from his Apoſtles, whoſe citations are from the veſion of the ſeventy Elders: we have a remarkable inſtance in St. *Paul*, to the *Hebrews*, "by "faith *Jacob* dying, bleſſed each of *Joſeph's* ſons, and "worſhiped on the ſummit of his rod or ſceptre" "*proſ-* "*kuneſen epi to akron tés rabdou autou :*" in the Hebrew text, 'tis "to the head of his bed *al roſh hamitah.*" The Apoſtle therefore ſhewing *Jacob's* faith, in worſhiping *Joſeph's* ſceptre as an emblem of Chriſt's ſceptre and kingdom, did not cite the Hebrew text as we have it.

In ſhort this truth is ſo manifeſt, that learned Proteſtants themſelves, not daring to riſque their reputation openly in the face of truth and conviction, have admitted it: *Chillingworth* in reply to this poſition of his adverſary, "the divinity of a writing cannot be "known by itſelf alone," but by ſome extrinſical authority ſays," *p.* 69. *N.* 49. "this you need not "prove for no wiſe man denies it." And *Hooker* confeſſedly a learned Proteſtant, ſays "of things neceſſary "the very chiefeſt is, to know what Books are to be "eſteemed holy, which point is confeſſed impoſſible for "the Scriptures to teach." *Eccl. poli. le.* i. *f.* 14.

Doctor *Covel*, ſays, and common ſenſe muſt have told him that "'tis not the word of God which aſſures "us, nor can it aſſure us, that we do well to think it "the word of God. *Def. Art.* 4. *p.* 31.

With what propriety then can this Man of ſcience, this *Jortin*, or *Coch.* call that a ſole and ſufficient rule of divine faith which he himſelf can, by no poſſibility know to be divine? 'tis univerſally admitted that divine faith is founded on the word of God ; if then his belief that the Scriptures are the word of God, be a meer human opinion, his faith can be no more : for 'tis a manifeſt abſurdity to pretend that the ſuperſtructure can be more firm than the foundation.

St. *Paul* was well aware of this concluſive reaſoning:

ing: hence he does not refer his disciple *Timothy* to the Scriptures, but says, the Apostle "keep the form "*upotupoſin* of sound words, which you heard from me "in faith and charity. 2 *Tim.* i. 13. Nor does he permit *Timothy*, to introduce his own opinions "have, "says he, the form of words, which you heard from "me." If the Apostle thought that the Scriptures were the only rule of faith, he would have delivered them signed and sealed into the hands of his disciple, with an injunction to transmit them in the same manner, or he would have been guilty of a most criminal neglect of duty, not providing for the propagation, and continuation of the faith in its integrity, by the only rule which our Ex. admits. However the Apostle was of a contrary opinion: he reduced to practice that sound principle which he taught in his Epistle to the Romans, "that faith is from hearing." x. 17. The Apostle did not say "faith is from reading." He would have excluded a great majority of the human race, by such an assertion as our Ex. does.

Let us suppose, that the Apostle had in fact delivered the Scriptures sealed and signed into the hands of his disciple, and ordered them to be transmitted in the same manner to his successors, that would not destroy nor even diminish the necessity of a living judge to determine the true construction of the law. No law ever explained itself. In all well regulated societies there must be some living authority to fix the geniune sense of the law, and prevent that variety, which must inevitably result from the fanciful constructions of ignorant or interested individuals. Therefore J. Christ, must have appointed a living judge to decide all controversies arising on the construction, which the dead letter of the law cannot decide, or he has been unaccountably negligent in the institution of his Church. In the old law we find this Judge expressly appointed: "if, said Moses, there happens a doubtful case in judg-"ment between blood and blood, cause and cause, le-

"proſy

" prosy and leprosy, and the words of the judges in " the gates do vary, *dibrei riboth beshearika* arise and " go up to the place which the Lord thy God shall " choose, and thou shalt come to the Priests of the " levitical race, and to the judge, who will be at that " time, and thou shalt inquire of them, and they will " announce to thee the word of judgement, and thou " shalt do according to the word, which will be an- " nounced from the place which God will have chosen, " according to the law which they will shew and ac- " cording to the judgement, which they will declare " thou shalt do ..... the man who in pride will " not hear the priest, then standing to minister there to " the Lord thy God and the judge, shall die, and thou " shalt remove evil from *Israel*, that the whole people " may hear and not swell with pride in future." *Deut.* xvii. Here we have a living judge appointed to decide all difficult controversies which might arise during the whole continuance of the Jewish dispensation. Death was the punishment of disobedience to the decision of the Sanhedrim, over which the high Priest presided, the only Judge who ever presided over the Jewish sanctuary.

If we believe the Evangelist St. *Matthew*, J. Christ was not so insensible to the future wants of his Church, as to leave it destitute of any visible authority to decide controversies, a prey to divisions, sects and schisms. We find a judge appointed with great authority in the Christian dispensation: the Saviour instructing his disciples and giving rules for paternal correction, directs them in case disappointment to tell the Church, " and if said he, the offender do not hear the Church, " let him be to thee as a heathen or a publican."—*Mat.* xviii. 17. The authority vested in the ecclesiastical judge in the old law was to decide, but to retrench the disobedient subject from the Jewish Church was the office of the civil Magistrate; in the new law J. Christ assigns the right of decision to the Church; but

he himſelf without conſulting the Magiſtrate, retrenches the diſobedient ſubject from the number of his diſciples, and ranks him amongſt heathens. 'Tis not neceſſary to remark that the Church being a moral body, ſpeaks by its Paſtors as the ſtate does by its Magiſtrates.

After all let us ſuppoſe that this man of ſcience, by dint of application, ſucceeds in diſcovering the original text, and the conformity of ſome one or other of our different verſions, which agree in nothing elſe but their diſagreement, with it, and thus by human induſtry diſcovers a rule of faith for himſelf, what rule will he give the unlearned proteſtant? who has neither time, nor means, nor talents, nor any one qualification for ſuch an intricate and laborious diſcuſſion? a diſcuſſion by the bye to which no man living is equal; a diſcuſſion which *Hooker*, *Chillingworth* and *Covel*, have pronounced impoſſible; which *Jurieu* and *Claude* have abandoned. Which the tranſlators of the Engliſh Bible have admitted to ſurpaſs the efforts of man: in the preface of an introduction to the Engliſh verſion of the Bible, publiſhed in 1655. The tranſlators ſay that they can produce no copy, which they can aſſure to agree in all points with the true original hand writing of the authors "wherefore ſay they, in the variety of copies, "what better means can ſo much as he invented to pick "out the true reading than the conferring of the moſt "choice and moſt ancient copies, and then to ſtand "to that reading which agrees beſt with the greater "part of the moſt ancient and the moſt choice copies? "this courſe St. *Jerom* and St. *Auſtin* took, &c."

This language ſounds harſhly to the unlearned Proteſtant's ear. Theſe learned tranſlators refer him to the Scriptures for that faith, without which St. *Paul* tells him, that he cannot pleaſe God—*Heb.* xi. 6. and almoſt in the ſame breath inform him that the verſion which they put into his hands may or may not contain the word of God: for if the copies to which they have had recourſe, be not conformable to the original

ginal text, which they ſay they don't know, or if, they have not given the intended ſenſe of the divine writer in their verſion, which the unlearned proteſtant cannot know, inſtead of the word of God, they give him their own words, and thus leave him to his own ſagacity. It muſt be great indeed, if, in ſuch a labyrinth he finds an iſſue. 'Tis true *Jurieu* and *Claude* relieve him: they tell him that revealed truths are felt as heat is felt near the fire, which neither ignorance, inattention, ſtupidity nor prejudice can prevent.

The Ex. paſſes in ſilence, as he pretends many diſputes and diſſentions, which divide and diſtract the members of our Church upon a variety of points both of diſcipline and doctrine. The writer begs leave to inform him that diſſentions on points of Catholic doctrine are not known in our ſchools; that the man, who would obſtinately deny any truth propoſed by the Catholic Church as of faith, would by the very act be retrenched from our communion. The object of Catholic faith are truths revealed, as ſuch decided and propoſed to the belief of the faithful by the authority of the Catholic Church. There are many truths, which are not the object of divine faith, theſe may found opinions, which no man is either obliged to believe or reject, or even to know or trouble his head about them: —Thus for inſtance, whether *Moſes* wrote the laſt chapter of *Deuteronomy*, which deſcribes his own death and burial, or whether this chapter was added by *Joſhua*, or ſome other writer after *Moſes's* death, is matter of opinion: the Ex. may chooſe without giving offence to any Church; but that the chapter is itſelf a part of the inſpired writings the Ex. muſt believe, or ceaſe to be a Chriſtian. And 'tis a moſt embarraſſing truth that he cannot believe it divinely inſpired but on the authority of the Catholic Church; which ſhews beyond a contradiction that, 'tis by the divine word conveyed to us by oral tradition we know the written word of God. In his next edition 'tis hoped that this

Ex. will assign some of these doctrinal points on which Catholics disagree. In his first essay he has been unfortunate, "they are far," says he, "from being agreed "on that most essential question, the extent and limits "of the power and jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff; "and 'tis to this day unsettled whether the Pope alone, "or a Pope and Council, or a Council without the "Pope, are possessed of infallibility; that infallibility "is lodged somewhere in the Romish Church, they are "all unanimous."

If the Ex. could prevail on himself to consult Catholic writers, and not borrow their doctrines from Creed makers, whom they have not authorised, he would find them perfectly agreed on this essential point: they say that the Roman Pontiff's spiritual jurisdiction extends as far as that of his predecessor St. *Peter*, that is, over the whole flock of J. Christ; that 'tis not limited to any part or portion, nor confined by geographical descriptions; that his power consists in feeding his master's flock in his master's pastures, that is, in proposing to their belief the truths of religion, which are revealed, and regulating their conduct by the rules of morality, which J. Christ has immediately by himself or by his Apostles, prescribed; and in forming such other regulations as the circumstances of times and countries render necessary for the observance of these; they add, that if he transgresses these powers in any instance, he is guilty of an offence, and stands accountable to his master; they think it an inversion of order for any inferior to judge his superior, and in this they are warranted by the common sense of mankind. Without order there is nothing but confusion; hence it follows that if J. Christ in the institution of his Church had permitted his disciples to act and think each according to the dictates of his own fancy, to the order and unity, which he found established in the Jewish Church, he would have substituted the greatest disorder and disunion imaginable.

To

To this pretended disagreement of Catholics, on the Roman Pontiff's jurisdiction, a disagreement, which exists but in the Exrs. imagination, or in these fanatical pamphlets in which the doctrine of Catholics is studiously disfigured in order to deceive the public, our Ex. adds a second yet greater if we believe him: "*p.* "43. to this day," says he, "it is unsettled, whether "the Pope alone, or the Pope and Council, or a Council without the Pope are possessed of infallibility.

To this bold assertion offered without even a shadow of proof, the writer replies that some 1750 years ago, 'twas a settled doctrine that infallibility in doctrinal decisions is claimed by the body of the Pastors united to their head on the promise of J. Christ to be with them till the end of time, *Mat. ult.* and the assistance of the Holy Ghost who was sent to teach them all truth.—*John* xvi. 13. On this article of doctrine there never was a shade of disagreement amongst Catholics: in the first Council of Jerusalem we find the subordinate Pastors in unison with St. *Peter*, their head, deciding the first controversy, which arbitrary constructions according to fancy, had produced; that is, whether the ceremonial part of the Jewish law continued to oblige in the Christian dispensation, and we find them declare their decision infallibly certain: for they ascribe it to the Holy Ghost, whom Christ had promised to send to teach them all things: *Jah.* xvi. 20.—it hath "seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, say they, "to impose no other burthen on you, but these things "necessary, that you abstain from things sacrificed to "idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and "from fornication."—*Acts* xv. 28.—The inspired writer gives a perfect model of an authentic decision of an ecclesiastical controversy: the Pastors assemble with their chief Pastor, examine the question; the chief Pastor first pronounces: "and after great disputation *Peter* rising said to them, men, brethren, you "know that in former days God made choice amongst

"us

" us, that the *Gentiles* by my mouth ſhould hear the " word of the Goſpel and believe . . . . . the mul- " titude was ſilent . . . . . then *James* anſwered ſay- " ing: . . . . . wherefore I judge that they, who " from amongſt the Gentiles are converted to God are " not to be diſquieted." The ſubordinate Paſtors judge with the chief Paſtor, and their united ſentence decides the controverſy without appeal. They at the ſame time enact a law which the circumſtance of the time rendered neceſſary, that is, they ordered the faithful to abſtain from blood and ſtrangled meats, which was to the Jews an abomination, and if authorized might be an obſtacle to their converſion; they alſo forbid the uſe of things offered to idols, which might have been an inducement to the new converts to aſſiſt at the heathen ſacrifices, and fornication, which though forbidden by the natural law, was not thought in any ſenſe criminal by the heathens. The prohibition againſt the uſe of blood and ſtrangled meats ceaſed, when the reaſons on which the law was founded ceaſed to exiſt, the deciſion of faith ſubſiſts in its whole force: becauſe the doctrines of faith are invariable; on this model have all religious controverſies been decided by the Catholic Church, and all her deciſions of faith have been formed. In theſe deciſions there are no new articles of faith introduced, but theſe doctrines received from the Apoſtles which are oppoſed by innovators and pretended reformers, are ſolemnly declared to be the ſettled doctrines of the Catholic Church, a part of that depoſite of faith once delivered to the ſaints, *St. Ju.* and by them tranſmitted through their ſucceſſors down to us.

To pretend that theſe deciſions are yet ſubject to the examination of individuals is to encourage pride and obſtinacy; to authorize a palpable inverſion of order; to encourage the ſheep to conduct the ſhepherd contrary to the principles of common ſenſe as well as to the precept of J. Chriſt, and practice of the Apoſtles.

tles. If ever that precept of J. Chriſt, " he " that will not hear the Church let him be to thee as " a heathen," be applicable 'tis in this caſe, where the Church ſolemnly ſpeaks by the mouth of her paſtors.

We find alſo that the faithful were not permitted to examine the deciſion of the Council " as *Paul* and *Si-* " *las* paſſed through the cities they directed them to " obſerve the edicts adjudged by the Apoſtles and " Prieſts in Jeruſalem, *ta dogmata ta kekrimena.*"— *Acts* xvi. 4. They did not order them to examine them, but to obſerve them *phulaſſein*, the reader will pleaſe to remark that though *Paul* and *Barnaby* were Apoſtles, eminent in ſcience and virtue, and conſpicuous for the miracles which God wrought by them, the faithful in the city of *Antioch*, did not think their authority ſufficient to decide the controverſy: 'twas brought before the Apoſtles and Prieſts in Jeruſalem, and there, with the concurrence of the Chief Paſtor *Peter*, the controverſy was finally ſettled. The queſtion was not brought before the civil magiſtrate, nor do we find any of the laity aſſiſt at the Council but as witneſſes: the Apoſtles frame the deciſion, publiſh and enforce it. What would the faithful of the primitive Church have thought of an obſcure monk declaiming againſt the firſt Paſtor, in the moſt indecent and ſcurrilous language and cenſuring the whole body of theſe Paſtors whom Chriſt gave to his Church for the ſpace of fourteen or fifteen hundred years? would they who obliged St. *Paul* to ſhew that his doctrine was the ſame, which St. *Peter* and the other Apoſtles taught, have believed a furious declaimer on his bare aſſertion?

'Tis irkſome to be obliged to correct the inaccuracies of this Ex'rs. ſtatement: in almoſt every line he blunders, whether through ignorance or deſign is not eaſy to determine: " Let us ſee," ſays he, *p.* 44, " what is the nature of the dignity, which is attributed " to the Pope or Biſhop of Rome. The eſſence of it

" indeed

" indeed is comprehended in Mr. *Burke's* definition," —" all the authority which Chriſt exerciſed on earth." Mr. *B.* gave no definition of the Roman Pontiff's authority in p. 30, and 31, which the Ex. cites Mr. *B.* offered a peremptory reaſon to ſhew that J. Chriſt had conferred no temporal power or civil authority on *Peter.* In order to evince this truth Mr. *B.* advances what is inconteſtibly true, " that the powers, which J. " Chriſt conferred on *Peter* are not greater than theſe, " which he himſelf exerciſed on earth, whilſt he re- " mained on it as a mortal man ;" in the cloſe of that paragraph Mr. *B.* ſaid that the only authority which he veſted in *Peter* was that which he himſelf, whilſt in his mortal ſtate and viſible here on earth exerciſed ; and having ſhewn that J. Chriſt exerciſed no temporal authority on earth, he concluded that *Peter* poſſeſſed no ſuch authority ; he added that J. Chriſt did not communicate to *Peter* all the powers which he poſſeſſed even as a mortal man : becauſe ſome of them are *incommunicable*, the Ex. cites this laſt ſentence, but ſuppreſſes the terms *a mortal man* which determine the ſenſe of the phraſe. They were not to his purpoſe. With what propriety then does this Ex. charge Mr. *B.* with having attributed to the Pope all the powers which J. Chriſt exerciſed on earth ?

The confuſed manner in which he pretends to ſtate our doctrines in that behalf would require a volume to unravel it. Why pretend to write on a ſubject with which he ſeems totally unacquainted ? or if he has been forced to write, why not endeavour to know ſomething of the matter ? from titles which he in our name liberally beſtows on the Pope, he concludes for us, that the Pope is infallible. Would to the heavens he were impeccable ! we know to our coſt that he is not. However to this firſt concluſion the writer replies that the Ex. may believe the Pope infallible or not, without ceaſing to be an Orthodox Catholic. To his ſecond concluſion, that is, that the Pope enjoys full power

over

over all nations and kingdoms, the writer replies that Mr. *Burke* has ſhewn in that very Letter of Inſtruction, under Examination, that the Pope does not poſſeſs an atom of civil power or temporal juriſdiction over any one town or village in the whole world beyond the territories which he governs as a temporal Prince. To the Ex'rs. next concluſion the reply is ſimple, " the " Pope," ſays the Ex. " is above all Councils:" A General Council is not celebrated without the Pope's concurrence and approbation, never was, nor ever will be, 'tis a manifeſt abſurdity to pretend that the Pope out of Council is greater than himſelf united with the body of Paſtors in Council, an abſurdity which no Catholic ever believed or aſſerted. If refractory men aſſume, to themſelves the name of a Council, we call it an unlawful aſſembly poſſeſſed of no authority at all. Does the Ex. imagine that half a dozen apoſtate Monks aſſembled in ſome corner of Germany without miſſion or authority, form a general Council repreſenting that Church of J. Chriſt, which is diſperſed over the whole Chriſtian world? " to him," continues the Ex.—that is to the Pope,—" all Catholics are bound to promiſe " due obedience." Yes, in ſpirituals; in all that regards temporal power and civil juriſdiction, they owe him no obedience at all—they promiſe him none. " And under his authority, the Romiſh Church is the " only Catholic and Apoſtolic Church." We Catholics believe the Church of Chriſt to be *one*, 'tis an article of the Nicene Creed which the Ex. is ſworn to believe. All the different Churches ſo called in a limited ſenſe as the Church of Aſia or Africa, &c. in communion with the See of Rome, are but integrant parts of that *one whole*, the Catholic Church, as the branches are integrant parts of the tree, not the tree itſelf, which is compoſed of the root, ſtock and branches; or as the different members of the human body are integrant parts of the body, not the body itſelf, which is compoſed of the head, the trunk, and the members; and as the

Church of J. Chriſt is a living body, 'tis animated by the ſame ſpirit, thinks and ſpeaks the ſame language. Hence the Apoſtle *Paul* ſays, " that faith is one *mia* " *piſtis.*—*Ep.* iv. 5.—and elſewhere he ſays, " that you " may think the ſame thing have the ſame charity, be " of the ſame mind *ſumpſuchoi.*—*Phil.* ii. 2. thinking " the ſame one thing *to én phronountes.*" The Apoſtle was ſo far from permitting the faithful to think and ſpeak each man according to his own fancy in matters of faith, that three ſeveral times, in the ſame phrase, he orders them to be unanimous in the ſame faith and charity.

As the branches receive their nouriſhment from the root through the ſtock, not the ſtock from the branches; and in like manner the members receive their nouriſhment from the body, not the body from the members, hence it follows that a branch may be lopped from the ſtock, or a member, which is but an integrant part, may be retrenched from the body, without deſtroying the body; but the head, being an eſſential part, cannot be ſevered from the body without the deſtruction of the individual. From this reaſoning 'tis manifeſt that any national Church, ſo called in a limited ſenſe, being but an integrant part of the Catholic Church, may be lopped off and fall into ruins; but the body of the Catholic Church united to its head never can, becauſe 'tis the body of J. Chriſt as St. *Paul* expreſsly teaches in many places.—" And he, (that is " God the Father,) gave him, J. C. who is head over " all things *uper panta*, to the Church, which is his " body. *Eph.* i. 22, 23. And alſo diligently preſerving " the unity of the ſpirit in the bond of peace, one body and " one ſpirit, iv. 3, 4." 'Tis the Holy Ghoſt, that animates this body, it muſt therefore at all times be a living body: for 'tis blaſphemy to aſſert that the body of J. Chriſt ſhould die, or that the Holy Ghoſt, who is life itſelf and author of life ſhould animate a carcaſe.

The Ex. ſays, *p.* 45.—" taking for his ground work " that

" that the church of Rome is the only true church he Mr. " *B.* denies the validity of all other ordinations." This " aſſertion has no foundation either in Mr. *B*'s Let. or in truth: Mr. *B.* never denied the validity of the ordination of Miniſters in any Church, nor inquired whether their ordinations were invalid or not: 'twas foreign to his purpoſe. And the Writer begs leave to inform this Rev. Ex. that Catholics have at all times believed the validity of ordination amongſt the *Arians*, who denied the divinity of J. Chriſt; amongſt the *Neſtorians*, *Eutychians*, *Donatiſts*, &c. and no Catholic ever doubted the validity of ordination amongſt the remains of theſe ſectaries yet ſcattered in the Eaſt. If ſome Catholics diſpute the validity of the Engliſh ordination, that's a queſtion of fact, not of faith: the account given by *Parſons*, *Fitzherbert*, *Holywood*, and *Champney*, of the conſecration of Meſſrs *Parker*, *Jewel*, *Horn*, &c. the firſt Proteſtant Biſhop's in Queen *Elizabeth's* days at the ſign of the Nag's Head, in Cheapſide, has a farcical appearance. 'Tis denied by *Bramhall*, *Maſon*, and ſome others, the reaſons offered on both ſides may be the ſubject matter of a curious and critical diſcuſſion, which no Catholic is obliged to make.

The Ex. borrowing ſome hackneyed arguments, which have been ſolidly refuted many years before his birth, enters on a ſerious controverſy, a controverſy which of all others he ought to avoid. It has proved ruinous to every new modelled ſyſtem which has relieved the miniſters of religion from all the painful duties, which the ſimplicity of our anceſtors thought attached to their ſtate; and opened to them all theſe enjoyments and pleaſures which the ſeverity of Catholic diſcipline denied them.

The infallibility in doctrinal deciſions claimed by the Catholic Church is, ſays our Ex. a miracle. By a miracle was hitherto underſtood a temporary ſuſpenſion of ſome eſtabliſhed law of nature in the viſible world: all natural agents, by that power of agency

which they hold from the author of nature, in similar circumstances produce similar effects. That such an agent should possess such a power is absolutely dependent on the will of the Creator; that these powers are inherent in natural agents we learn from experience: thus for example that a stone gravitates we know by invariable experience; if this tendeney to the centre be suspended by a visible agent 'tis a greater power which overcomes a less, in it there is nothing uncommon; but if this tendency to the centre be suspended by an invisible agent, it excites admiration in the beholders, and is called a miracle, *quia mirandum.* Miracles are known to the persons who are present by the testimony of their senses, to others by the testimony of witnesses, to future generations by oral tradition. Thus *Josue*, *Caleb*, and their cotemporaries believed the miracles wrought by *Moses* on the testimony of their senses, their children born in the land of Canaan, knew them on the testimony of their fathers, and we know them but by tradition: for though they be written in the Pentateuch, 'tis by tradition we know the Pentateuch to be authentic, and to contain the word of God; if we know it to be infallibly true that these miracles were wrought, the witness which attests it must be infallibly true: otherwise we might know facts to be infallibly true on the testimony of a fallible witness. 'Tis on the testimony of the Church, this day, now in being, that we know these miraculous facts to have happenned: because 'tis on her testimony that we know the books in which they are related to be divine. We must therefore either believe her testimony infallibly true, or cease to be Christians. Thus all these specious arguments, which our Ex. has borrowed from men, whose object was not truth, but merely to give falsehood some colour of truth, are by this simple reasoning which bears no reply, shewn to be fallacious.

To call that which is in the ordinary course of God's providence a miracle, is a manifest absurdity: with

equal

equal propriety the riſing and ſetting of the ſun, and the variety of ſeaſons depending on the earth's relative poſition, may be called miraculous; for this variety is not more neceſſary to fulfil the views of the Creator, in the natural order of the viſible world, than the infallibility of the Church to fulfil the views of the Redeemer in the ſupernatural order: for ſince, according to the order which he has eſtabliſhed, 'tis by believing the truths which he has taught, and obſerving the law, which he has inſtituted that his elect till the end of time are to be ſaved, 'twas indiſpenſably neceſſary that he ſhould give them an infallible rule to know the truths which they muſt believe, and the rules of action, which they muſt obſerve; no other rule has been given but the uninterrupted tradition of the Catholic Church. In vain the Ex. has recourſe to the Scriptures: it has been ſhewn deciſively already more than once that the Scriptures themſelves cannot be known but by the teſtimony of the Church, hence 'tis evident that this infallibility in doctrinal deciſions is ſo far from being miraculous, that 'tis indiſpenſably neceſſary to fulfil the Redeemer's views.

In a ſeries of propoſitions our Ex. undertakes to prove that this infallibility is a miracle. His firſt propoſition ſcarcely deſerves a refutation. Man, he ſays, is a fallible creature. Who ever doubted it? but may not this creature fallible by its native conſtitution be rendered infallible by divine aſſiſtance? were not the Apoſtles and all the ſacred writers men? were not they by nature fallible? yet the Ex. believes, or at leaſt pretends to believe their writings infallibly true. Was it from the union of many fallible beings that this quality of infallibility, a quality of the Ex'rs. invention, reſulted? no—but from the divine aſſiſtance. And may not the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe influence rendered the deciſions of theſe primitive Paſtors of the Church infallible, continue to direct the Paſtors of the Church to the end of time? is his power diminiſhed?

are

are his cares of the Church leſſened? his promiſes forgotten? in a word, the Church of the preſent day is it leſs immediately under the protection of J. Chriſt its founder, and the Holy Ghoſt its inſtructor than 'twas in former days? but how is this infallibility to be proved? to this the writer replies by a queſtion of the ſame import: how was the infallibility of the Scripture writers proved? they wrought miracles. Many of the ſacred penman are not known to us. We don't know whether they wrought miracles or not. Of theſe we know, there are ſome, of whoſe miracles we have no account. What miracles were wrought by the great prophets *Jeremias*, *Ezekiel*, *Zacharias?* they aſſerted that 'twas the word of God which they announced. So did *Sedecias* the falſe prophet—ſo did *Martin Luther*—ſo do many others of the ſame ſtamp; but our Ex. replies: "that the teſtimony of men in "their own cauſe, and to their own advantage was ne-"ver admitted to be good evidence in any cauſe." *p.* 49. We muſt according to this mode of reaſoning not only reject the writings of all the prophets of whoſe miracles we know nothing; but alſo the teſtimony of *John Baptiſt* in his own favour: he wrought no miracle at all; the teſtimony of St. *Paul* when he ſaid that he was tranſported into the heavens and heard myſterious words *arréta Rémata*, and the teſtimony of Chriſt himſelf when he ſaid that "all power in heaven and earth was given "to him."—*Mat. ult.*

Let us deſcend from the writers of the Old Teſtament to the writers of the New: it does not appear that St. *Paul* wrought any miracles to confirm the truth of his Epiſtle to the Romans before he had ſeen them; nor do we read of miracles wrought in confirmation of the truth of any of his Epiſtles. We read, 'tis true, in the Scriptures of many miracles wrought, ſome by the writers themſelves, and ſome by others of the ſame religious profeſſion. All theſe are teſtimonies of men in their own favour, conſequently of no force,

if

if the Ex'rs. reaſoning be concluſive; finally, though we may admit that miracles were wrought in confirmation of the truth contained in all the Canonical books, not one of theſe miracles were wrought in the preſence of the Ex. he therefore can have no certainty of their exiſtence but by the teſtimony of that Church in whoſe hands the Scriptures were found. Hence it follows that this Ex. whether he will or not, muſt have recourſe to the teſtimony of the Church for truth: becauſe he cannot find it elſewhere.

The Ex'rs. reaſoning would have been juſtly and with great truth and propriety applied to a *Luther*, a *Bucer*, a *Melancton*, and to all ſuch intruders and innovators, who impudently aſſume powers and authority to which they have no legal right, nor even a diſtant claim, and of which they give no other proof but their own bare aſſertion; but to tell men legally veſted with power and authority, that their teſtimony is of no force, is offenſive to common ſenſe: would the Ex. dare tell the Britiſh Parliament that their teſtimony in favour of the privileges of their body is of no force? they might be tempted, by force, to chaſtiſe ſuch inſolence.

Can this Ex. prevail upon himſelf to admit that we Catholics diſperſed over the Chriſtian world in communion with the See of Rome, believe in tranſubſtantiation? that we believe it lawful and laudable to pray for the ſouls of the faithful? will he admit that the Prelates who compoſed the Council of Trent ſolemnly declared that theſe were the ſettled doctrines of all the Churches in communion with the See of Rome in 1517, when *Martin Luther* firſt oppoſed the Pope? will he admit that the Prelates, who compoſed the General Council of *Latran*, in 1215, declared, "that "in the Sacrament of the Altar, the body and blood "of Chriſt is truly contained under the appearances of "bread and wine." This is a teſtimony of Catholic Prelates in favour of the doctrine which they believed

and

and taught, and was univerſally believed and taught in their days. Will he admit the teſtimony of the Prelates, who compoſed the firſt General Council of Nice, in the year 325, in favour of the ſame doctrine? thus we read in the Acts of that Council: "*item.* Here "in the divine table let us not be abjectly intent on the "bread and cup expoſed to view: but elevating our "minds by faith let us underſtand that the Lamb of "God, who taketh away the ſins of the world, is pla- "ced on the ſacred table; that he is in an unbloody "manner ſacrified by the Prieſts; and that we truly "receiving his precious body and blood believe them "to be the ſymbols of our reſurrection; for this we "don't receive much but little, that we may know that "they are not received to ſatiety, but to ſanctification." This teſtimony is admitted to be genuine by Proteſtant writers of greateſt note. By *John Occolompade*, in his dialogue with *Nathaniel*, by *John Calvin.—Lib.* 4. *Ins. Cap.* 17. By *Peter Boquin*, &c. 'tis true they make ſome ſilly attempts to diſtort the words of the Council from their natural and evidently intended ſignification: as if the Council exhorted the faithful to receive Chriſt by faith in the Heavens, though the Prelates ſay in terms as ſtrong as language can furniſh, "that he is ſacrificed in an unbloody manner by the "Prieſts; that we truly receive his precious body and "blood the ſymbols, that is the pledges of our reſur- "rection."

And what does this Ex. think of the teſtimony of the diſciples of the great St. *Andrew*, who wrote the Acts of his martyrdom at which they were preſent? they tell us that the Apoſtle ordered by the Pro-conſul Ægeas to ſacrifice to the Gods, replied, "I ſacrifice every day "the immaculate Lamb to the Almighty God . . . . "Who though truly ſacrificed and his fleſh truly eaten "by the people, perſeveres entire." When the Pro-conſul deſirous of knowing how 'twas poſſible that the Lamb could be eaten and yet remain living and entire, threatened

threatened to force the Apoſtle by torments to explain to him this myſtery of religion, St. *Andw.* replied " that " 'twas not poſſible to come to a knowledge of this my- " ſtery without faith in Chriſt." If the bread and wine, as innovators pretend, had been received ſimply in commemoration of the death of Chriſt, there was nothing more eaſy than to tell him, that 'twas not the Lamb itſelf that was eaten but the figure of the Lamb, which any man poſſeſſed of common ſenſe would have underſtood on the expoſition.

The authenticity of this teſtimony has never been diſputed, nor has the writer ever heard of any attempt made by invators to elude the force of it.

This is a ſpecimen of that tradition by which Catholics evince the truth of their doctrine. They ſhew by teſtimonies, which their adverſaries are forced to acknowledge genuine, that the doctrines which they now believe and teach, were believed and taught in every age of the Church ſince the Apoſtles days. Thence they infer that they are the doctrines taught by the Apoſtles, and the inference is ſo forcibly concluſive, that all efforts to elude it are vain. As the writer does not write a treatiſe on the Euchariſt, he omits the intermediate teſtimonies of this Catholic truth, which are numerous in all the different ages of the Church.

When this Ex. ſays, that he muſt totally object to tradition, he enters a proteſt againſt all the writers, who have appeared before *Martin Luther's* days, and againſt all the different Councils which were aſſembled at different times both in the Eaſt and Weſt. But will this Ex. give us ſimple men leave, who do not eaſily conceive that an obſcure Monk in Saxony was more intelligent than the *Juſtins*, the *Auſtins*, the *Gregorys*, the *Jeroms*, than all the Paſtors of the Catholic Church, not only in his own time, but during a ſpace of 1500 years before, will he, once more, permit us to believe that theſe men knew the doctrine which they themſelves taught, that they knew the doctrine which was

univerſally taught in the Church? if ſo, the controverſy is at an end. For by tradition we Catholics underſtand neither leſs nor more than the doctrines taught by the Apoſtles to their immediate diſciples and ſucceſſors in the paſtoral charge, and tranſmitted to us in regular ſucceſſion, theſe we know from the univerſal practice of the Church and the concurring teſtimony of its Paſtors and Teachers; and the man who does not believe theſe doctrines true is not a Chriſtian.

Let us conſider this argument of our Ex. in another point of view, it being the firſt he muſt have thought it the moſt concluſive, "the teſtimony of men in their "own cauſe and to their own advantage was never ad- "mitted to be good evidence in any cauſe." Will this Ex. tell us from whom we may learn the doctrine taught by the Paſtors of the Catholic Church if not from themſelves? ſhall we have recourſe to the Jews or Mahometans? they know nothing of the matter;— ſhall we learn it from Proteſtants? there were none before the reformation in 1517. From whom ſhall we learn the privileges, prerogatives, and uſages of Parliament if not from themſelves or the public records kept by the proper officers under their inſpection? where was the Court before which the *Romiſh Clergy*, under which denomination all the Paſtors of the Catholic Church diſperſed over the Chriſtian world muſt be underſtood, was to appear, and plead? we always find the Chief Paſtors aſſembled in Council, compoſing the Court and deciding all controverſies which aroſe amongſt individuals; condeming all novelties as inconſiſtent with the eſtabliſhed and ſettled doctrines, which from the very nature of things they muſt have known, as theſe and theſe only were publicly taught in all their reſpective Churches; nor do we find that they ever referred the contending parties to the Scriptures for a deciſion: thus the Apoſtles in the Council of Jeruſalem, *Acts* xv. decided the controverſy on the legal ceremonies; the Council of Nice decided the contro-

verſy

verſy againſt the Arians, who denied the divinity of J. Chriſt. In the year 325, the Council of Conſtantinople condemned the Macedonians, who denied the divinity of the Holy Ghoſt in 381; the 1ſt of *Epheſus* condemned the Neſtorians, who introduced two perſons in Chriſt in 431; the Council of Chalcedon condemned the Eutychians, who confounded the divine and human natures in Chriſt in 451; the 3rd of Conſtantinople condemned the Monothelites ſo called becauſe that they believed in Chriſt but one will, in 680; the ſecond of Nice in 787 condemned the Iconoclaſts or Image Breakers; a Council at Rome, in 1050, condemned *Berengarius*, the firſt who denied tranſubſtantiation, though not the real preſence of J. Chriſt in the Holy Sacrament of the Euchariſt. As this error has been ſince revived and is now prevalent in all reformed Churches, it may not be amiſs to give a ſhort account of its author, taken from cotemporary writers: he was a profeſſor at Tours, Archdeacon of Angers, took offence at *Lantfranc*: who taught with great celebrity at the Monaſtery of Bec in Normandy, made heavy complaints againſt him, becauſe many had left his own ſchool to go to that of *Lantfranc*; in this perturbed ſtate of mind, he began to publiſh his error, which was immediately refuted by *Lantfrane* and others, condemned by the Biſhops *Adelman*, of Breſcia, and *Hugh*, of Langres. In their letters to *Berengarius*, they reproached him with being the firſt author of this Error, and ſeriouſly admoniſhed him to retract. *Guitmundas*, Lib. 3, near the end, ſays, "*notissimum* "*eſt hoc tempore prius quam Berengarius insanisset*, "*hujus modi vesanias nusquam fuisse.*"—"'Tis public- "ly known that before *Berengarius's* madneſs ſuch "folly was no where." And we know from *Paſchaſius* that in 865 when he wrote there was no ſuch folly in the world: in his book on the words of the inſtitution *this is my Body*, he ſays, "that though there "were ſome who moved ſome queſtions on the truth

" of Chriſt's Body in the Sacrament, there was no man " who publicly denied it. He alludes to *John Scotus*, and *Bertram* a Monk of Corbie; in whoſe writings there are ſome incoherent ambiguities on the queſtion. " Though ſome through ignorance err, ſaid *Paſchaſias*, " there is no body yet in public, who contradicts this to " be ſo, which the world believes and confeſſes." *Lanfranc* in his Letter to *Berengarius*, deſcribes the aſtoniſhment of the Prelates aſſembled in Council under *Leo* the IX. when *Berenger's* Letter was read in which 'twas aſſerted that Chriſt was not ſubſtantially preſent in the Euchariſt—a contradiction not only to the Catholic Faith but to the univerſal practice of the Chriſtian world. In his laſt book againſt *Berenger*, he ſays, " aſk all theſe who have any knowledge of our " language and our learning; aſk the Greeks, the Ar- " menians, aſk Chriſtians of any denomination or na- " tion, with one voice they will all atteſt that they " hold this faith." *Ber.* finding himſelf condemned by all Chriſtians, retracted his errors; but through that inconſtancy which characteriſes all innovators and pretended reformers, relapſed, was again condemed, retracted once more, and died at length in the communion of the Church. His followers were few, and ſoon diſappeared; the Error was revived by *Wiclef* 300 years after, but confined to a few in England, who alſo diſappeared in a ſhort time; and ſo univerſal was the doctrine of the real preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt in the year 1518, when *Carloſtadt* and *Zuingluis* began to innovate, that *Zuingluis* himſelf, in his commentaries on the true and falſe religion, ſays *Cap. de Eu.* that at firſt he had acted in a very private manner, and had conferred with a few friends on propoſing his new doctrine. He feared to give public offence by introducing a novelty contradicted by the practice of the Chriſtian world.

As ſoon as this new doctrine appeared, *Luther* himſelf, jealous perhaps of not having the honor of the invention

vention, undertook a defence of the real preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt. His diſpute with *Carloſtadt* on this ſubject commenced in a comical manner: *Carloſtadt*, baniſhed from Wirtemberg, retired to Orlemonde, a city of Thuringia. He there preached againſt *Luther*, whom he called a flatterer of the Pope becauſe he had retained ſome parts of the Maſs; he was very wrong: *Luther* did not flatter the Pope. This however excited tumults in Orlemonde. *Luther* was ſent by the Elector of Saxony to appeaſe the troubles: on his way he preached at Iene, in preſence of *Carloſtadt*, called him a ſeditious fellow; after the ſermon *Carloſtadt* came to an Inn at the ſign of the *Black Bear*, where *Luther* lodged; there he told *Luther* that he could not bear his opinion of the *real preſence*. *Luther*, who was not remarkable for modeſty, defied him to write againſt him *(Luther)* and promiſed him a florin of gold, if he undertook it; *Carloſtadt* put the florin in his pocket; they ſhook hands, promiſed each other fair play. *Luther* drank to *Carloſtadt's* health and to the work which he had then in embryo. *Carloſtadt* anſwered in the ſame ſtrain, ſwallowed a bumper, and thus the war began the 22d of Auguſt, 1524, which continues yet between the *Lutherans* and *Zuinglians*—their parting is amuſing enough:—" may " I ſee you on the wheel," ſays *Carloſtadt* to *Luther*; " may you break your neck before you leave the town," replies *Luther*—and ſo they parted. The fact is thus related by *Hoſpinian*, a Proteſtant writer, *Par.* 3 *v. ad An.* 1524, and by *Luther* himſelf, in his letter to *Argentin. Epis. ad. Ag. S.* 7. In a letter which *Hoſpinian* gives 2 *part ad An.* 1534, *Luther* ſays, " the Pa- " piſts themſelves are forced to give me the praiſe of " having defended better than they the doctrine of the " literal ſenſe; and in fact I am ſure that though they " were all melted together, they could never maintain " ſo ſtrongly as I." This boaſt of *Luther* was ill-founded; for the diſciples of *Zuinglius* and *Carloſtadt* ſhewed

ſhewed by invincible proofs that, if the literal ſenſe of the words of inſtitution, *this is my Body*, be the intended ſenſe, tranſubſtantiation muſt be admitted, not that conſubſtantiation which *Luther* had ſubſtituted, and which the Lutherans continue to believe. Truth claims no protection from the abbettors of error; light and darkneſs exclude each the other: the reader will pardon this digreſſion. Let us reſume the Council of Conſtance in 1413, condemned *Wiclef's* Errors revived in part by *John Huſs*, and finally the Council of Trent in 1564, condemned *Luther's* Errors, and a multiplicity of others, which at that unlucky epoch began to disfigure the face of Chriſtianity. Thus we ſee the conduct of the Church has been uniformly the ſame ſince the Apoſtles days: whenever a new doctrine was introduced and from that attachment to novelty and impatience of reſtraint which flatters our vitiated inclinations, obtained followers, the chief Paſtors aſſembled; they examined the doctrine propoſed, compared it with the doctrine univerſally eſtabliſhed, which they of all neceſſity muſt have known. Finding it inconſiſtent with the ſettled doctrine of the church univerſally taught and believed, they cenſured it, declaring it no part of the depoſite of faith, no part of the doctrine once delivered to the Saints which St. *Jude* recommends. i. 6.

To pretend as the Ex. does that they are judges in their own cauſe is an artifice intended to amuſe the uninformed, and divert their attention from the real ſtate of the queſtion: the Prelates are witneſſes of the faith, which is univerſal, that is Catholic, which they received from their predeceſſors and judges of the controverſy which is introduced by turbulent individuals, expreſsly to diſturb the peace and harmony of Chriſt's flock, over whom theſe Prelates are placed by the Holy Ghoſt, if we believe St. Paul "attend to yourſelves and "to the whole flock, in which the H. G. has placed you "Biſhops '*episcopous*' to rule '*poimanean*' the Church

"of

" of God, which he has acquired with his blood." The Apoſtle did not order the flock to attend to the care of their Biſhops and rule them; he did not direct a furious Monk to deſert his Convent, to break his vows and oaths, to diſregard all engagements divine and human, free himſelf from all reſtraints of religion, and maſk his apoſtacy under the pretence of reforming religion. No, obedience is the duty which he recommends to him, " obey," ſays the Apoſtle writing to the Hebrews, " your guides *égoumenois* and be ſubject to " them *úpeikete*, for they watch over your ſouls as being " accomptable, *òs logan apodoſontes*." xiii. 17. Nor did the Apoſtle refer the faithful to the Scriptures; but to their guides, from them they were to learn the truths of faith and the maxims of Chriſtian morality.

Our Ex. has diſcovered by ſome new revelation that a great part of Chriſt's life was ſpent in combating the Jews, *p.* 48. We find him reproach the Scribes and Phariſees with having corrupted one of God's precepts by their own tradition that is by the falſe interpretation which they gave that ordinance; *Matt.* xv. *Mark* vii. he does not ſpeak of the traditions of the Jewiſh Church under the direction of the High Prieſt and great Sanhedrim the true Paſtor of that Church, but he corrects the falſe interpretation of ſome Scribes and Phariſees, Hypocrites who like all pretended reformers undertook on their own private authority to explain the law in that ſenſe, which was moſt favourable to their intereſt and paſſions; when the Saviour ſpoke of the lawful Paſtors of the Jewiſh Church, whoſe province it was to expound the law, and atteſt the truth of tradition, he ſtrictly enjoined obedience and ſubmiſſion to their deciſions and orders; " they ſit," ſays he, " in *Moſes's* chair, whatſoever they ſay to you, " obſerve and do it." *Matt.* xxiii. 2. By theſe words the Saviour authoriſes the infallibility of deciſion in the Jewiſh Church, which the Ex. denies to the Chriſtian Church, though St. *Paul* expreſsly ſays that we have

better

better promiſes: *Heb.* viii. 6. Nor does the Saviour aſcribe this authority to the perſonal qualities of the Jewiſh Paſtors, who were extremely corrupt in their morals; but to the chair of *Moſes* on which they ſat, that is to the public miniſtry which by God's appointment they exerciſed.

The reader will eaſily remark that the Jews had no infallible means of diſtinguiſhing the Canonical Books from ſpurious works, but the tradition of the Prieſts and Paſtors of that Church, who atteſted that ſuch and ſuch books were tranſmitted to them by their predeceſſors as divinely inſpired; nor could the Jews learn the intended ſenſe of the Scriptures but from the ſame ſource. So true it is, that in the old law as well as in the new the *Church was the pillar and ground of truth.* Does the Ex. imagine that the Jewiſh Church, which was but a figure of the Chriſtian Church, poſſeſſed greater privileges than the reality?

The writer thanks the Ex. for admitting that the Romiſh Clergy have been in the habit of claiming infallibility for many centuries; he might have ſaid ſince the Apoſtles days without fearing a contradiction: 'twas at all times the eſtabliſhed doctrine of the Catholic Church, and upon the moſt ſolid grounds; 'tis true 'twas at all times denied by ſectaries of every deſcription and diſcrimination, from *Samuel* the Magician, down to the *univerſal friend Jemina Wilkinſon.* As to the pretended forgeries to eſtabliſh this claim they are totally unneceſſary: there are authentic monuments enough which *Moſheim Blondel* and the Century writers of Magdeburg will not conteſt. Whether the donation of *Conſtantine* the Great, or ſome decrees inſerted in Law Books, be genuine or ſpurious is foreign to the preſent queſtion, and equally foreign to the writer's purpoſe.

" An authority derived from God, can only be pro-
" ved," ſays the Ex. " by an expreſs declaration from
" him, manifeſted to mankind by methods perfectly
" incontrovertible;

" incontrovertible; either by the Holy Scriptures, or " by outward miracles." Does the Ex. expect that God ſhall make a new and expreſs declaration of his will to every ſucceeding generation? does he not think it ſufficient that God has made this declaration once before competent and credible witneſſes, and ordered them to inform their ſucceſſors? if the Ex. does not think this ſufficient, religion died with the Apoſtles, and that Spiritual Kingdom of which there was to be no end, *Luke* i. 33. ceaſed almoſt as ſoon as it began. The Ex. muſt permit us to believe that this declaration was made. We believe it on the authority and teſtimony of the Paſtors now in being, who received that faith from their immediate predeceſſors, theſe from the Paſtors to whom they were ſucceſſors, and ſo in regular ſucceſſion to the Apoſtles, who were the witneſſes choſen by God to communicate this declaration to the world. By the ſame rule we know the Scriptures and the intended ſenſe of difficult and ambiguous paſſages in the Scriptures. If the Ex. can aſſign any other infallible rule we ſhall adopt it. Whatever his ideas of *fancy* or *caprice* may be, or however uſeful theſe his rules may be in forming conſtructions on the law, they are totally incapable of aſcertaining the Books which contain the law. If then the Ex. of all neceſſity is obliged to have recourſe to the tradition of the Church for the Scriptures themſelves, why not for the genuine ſenſe of thoſe ambiguous paſſages in the Scriptures? Does he imagine that the wild conjectures of every enthuſiaſt, who pretends to explain the Scriptures according to his own *fancy* or *caprice*, convey the intended ſenſe of the divine writers? or does he pretend that the faith of his deluded followers formed on his fanciful interpretations is founded on the Scriptures? if ſo our Ex. has excluded not only Church authority, but alſo the authority of the Scriptures, and ſubſtitutes *fancy* and *caprice* as ſole and ſufficient rules of faith.

In his ſecond propoſition the Ex. aſſerts in the moſt

poſitive manner that the Scriptures are our only guide upon this head; thus he leaves all who are not perfectly well verſed in the Scriptures without a guide to grope their way in the dark. The writer begins to fear for himſelf, and thinks even the Ex. in ſome danger; there are paſſages in the Scriptures, which the writer cannot underſtand without having recourſe to the works of theſe early and intelligent writers whom we call the Fathers; theſe men who converſed with the Apoſtles or their immediate diſciples learnt from them the intended ſenſe of the inſpired writers, and from them we muſt learn it, not from the conjectures of modern ſpeculatiſts, who know no more of the matter than we do ourſelves. To refer a man to the Scripture as to his only guide, is to refer the benighted traveller to an intricate path inſtead of giving him a guide to conduct him through it, and enable him to avoid the precipices, which may be in the way: —The Ex. will ſurely admit that all the different ſectaries, who have hitherto appeared in the world, pretended to find their errors in the Scriptures, there are therefore ſome intricacies, ſome precipices in that path which render a guide indiſpenſibly neceſſary—St *Paul* thought ſo when he ſaid to the Hebrews, *obey your guides*.—xiii.

Let us deſcend to the Scriptures, our Ex'rs. laſt and only refuge, and ſee if they will ſhelter him: "All the "texts produced," ſays he, *p.* 50, "for that purpoſe "are ambiguous, uncertain, figurative, and their mean- "ing can only be diſcovered by conjecture, and the "uſual mode of interpretation."—But three lines before the Ex. had told us that Scripture is our only guide, and now he tells us that all the texts produced are *ambiguous*, *uncertain*, and *figurative*, that their meaning can only be diſcovered by conjecture. What an awful leſſon does the Ex. give to his Proteſtant Brethren? their only guide, he tells them, in a doctrine of the greateſt poſſible conſequence, in which a miſtake

miſtake is inductive of perdition, is an *ambiguous guide*, an *uncertain guide*, a guide whoſe meaning they muſt *conjecture*. What Catholic writer ever told a Proteſtant in more expreſſive language that he muſt have recourſe to ſome other guide? but the ſenſe of the Scriptures may be eaſily collected upon other ſubjects, true; but not on this, of all ſubjects the moſt important, on which this guide ought to ſpeak the moſt plain and intelligible language: for if it be true as we Catholics pretend that the doctrinal deciſions of the Paſtors of the Church in Council aſſembled and united to their viſible head be infallible; 'tis infallibly, true, that there are fundamental errors taught in all the reformed Churches. To encreaſe the anxiety of his friends our Ex. proceeds to lay down rules for underſtanding the language of this ambiguous guide—and after a multiplicity of words, which convey no determinate idea, he ſays at length, "if it can be ſhewn "that an infallible authority is unneceſſary as far "as meer reaſoning goes, it is a concluſive argument "againſt it." This concluſive argument in the next ſentence he reduces to a certain help in diſcovering the true meaning of a doubtful paſſage. What? the unlearned Proteſtant is firſt by logical reaſoning, of which he has no idea, to ſhew that this infallible authority is not neceſſary, and he will thus obtain a certain help to enable him to underſtand theſe ambiguous and uncertain texts. The Ex. cannot give the man a more ſtriking proof of the neceſſity of this infallible authority, than in this manner to refer him to himſelf, and torture him in the purſuit of the intended ſenſe of ambiguous texts which he can never diſcover to an abſolute certainty, and leave him in a ſtate of anxiety and fluctuation to his lateſt breath; the very ſtate in which St. *Paul* repreſents all theſe who withdraw themſelves from that very authority to which the Ex. prohibits obedience: "always learning and never coming to the "knowledge of the truth." 2 *Tim.* iii. 7.

The Ex. after conducting his reader through a maze of queſtions, the truth of the former depending on that of the ſubſequent as he ſays, comes at length, like a hare to her form, to ſhew that the Scriptures are ſufficient without this infallible authority. But are not theſe ambiguous and uncertain texts parts of the Scripture? why not ſay at once that the conjectural ſenſe of the Scripture is ſufficient? does the Ex. imagine that the inſpired writers intended contradictory ſenſes in the ſame ſentence? If two men underſtand the ſame propoſition, "*this is my Body*," in different ſenſes, of all neceſſity one of theſe two founds his faith on a falſe conjecture. We Catholics pretend that the reformers did ground their belief of the figurative preſence and real abſence of Chriſt's Body in the Euchariſt on a falſe conjecture: they dont admit the words which he ſpoke in their natural ſignification: therefore they conjecture, that he intended to ſay ſomething elſe, that is, this bread is the figure of my body: or, this bread ſignifies my body: or, this bread is the ſign of my body: or ſome one of an hundred different expoſitions given by the reformers to this obſtinate text. To this we Catholics reply that ninety nine out of the hundred are manifeſtly falſe; and we add that Chriſt ſaid preciſely what he intended to ſay neither leſs nor more: for he perfectly underſtood the language in which he ſpoke, and hence we conclude that of the hundred not one is true. And finally, which comes directly to the point, that ſuppoſing one of the hundred to be true, there is no Proteſtant learned, or unlearned, can determine it but by conjecture, and that the odds are ninety nine to one againſt him. Is not that a critical ſituation in a game when a man's all is at ſtake?

The inſufficiency of Scripture to guide us in the unerring paths of truth, has been ſhewn in ſo many different points of view in order, if poſſible to undeceive ſome well meaning men, who are unfortunately whirled about by every wind of doctrine, forming their faith,

not

not on the Scriptures which they don't understand, but on the fanciful expositions of every enthusiast who undertakes to direct them, forgetting that if the blind lead the blind they both fall in the ditch, nor is it an excuse to say: I believed such or such a teacher: because Christ has warned his disciples more than once to beware of wolves in sheep's cloathing. *Matt.* vii. 15.

The first argument which the Ex. states in support of his pretended sufficiency of the Scriptures, if rightly understood proves the contrary: "to assert," says he, "that when Christ came into the world to save sinners, "he did not teach them all things necessary to that end, "or that when the Evangelists were inspired to commit "those doctrines to writing, the inspiration was imper- "fect is to deny the goodness, the wisdom, and the "power of God." The Ex. was not aware that his first argument condemns all novelties in doctrine and leaves the pretended reformers without excuse; for there was no new revelation made to them and they had no possible mode of knowing the doctrine taught by Christ but by the testimony of these in whose hands it was deposited. 'Tis very true that Christ taught every thing necessary to salvation, but he did not write a line nor did he give the Scriptures as a guide to his disciples; he taught them with authority, *Matt.* vii. 9. gave his precepts in his public lectures, ordered his Apostles to teach and to preach to the people in the same manner; he reproached the Pharisees with examining the Scriptures in vain. "You examine the "Scriptures because you think to have life everlasting "in them, and they are giving testimony of me." *John* v. 39. As if he had said you are continually reading the Scriptures in which you think you may find life; yet these very Scriptures attest that life is not to be obtained but by faith in me. To this he adds, v. 40, "And you will not come to me that you may have "life." A man would imagine that he was giving a lecture to modern enthusiasts, who think that in the Scriptures

Scriptures alone life is to be found and diſdain to come to that fold, of which the Scriptures atteſt that, out of it there is no eternal life: becauſe 'tis in his fold that J. Chriſt feeds his ſheep by the miniſtry of theſe paſtors whom he has given to his Church. *Eph.* 4.

But was not the inſpiration of the Evangeliſts perfect? yes: and ſo was that of *Moſes* and the prophets; but that did not exclude the neceſſity of inſtituting a ſucceſſion of paſtors in the old law, whoſe province and duty 'twas to explain the inſpired writings to the people and offer ſacrifices in their name. Nor does the inſpiration of the New Teſtament, however perfect it may be, exclude the miniſtry of theſe Paſtors and teachers, whom, if we believe St. *Paul*, Chriſt gave to his Church for the perfection of the Saints. *Eph.* iv. 11. Will this Ex. inform us of what uſe is a teacher to a man who teaches himſelf? or what is the uſe of a Paſtor to a man who finds all the ſpiritual food which is neceſſary in the Scriptures? and not only finds it there, but according to the principles of the Ex. muſt find it there and not elſewhere. Why not ſubſtitute Printers to Biſhops and Miniſters in the Church of England? one tenth of their revenues would pay a ſufficient number of Printers, and the remaining nine tenths be a great ſaving to the nation.

The Ex. immediately adds that the Scriptures in many places declare their own ſufficiency. Not ſurely to a man who can't read them! muſt the poor fellow be damned without redemption or reſource? unfortunately for our Ex. the contradictory of his aſſertion is manifeſtly deduced from the paſſage which he offers in proof: "from a child thou has known the Scriptures," ſaid St. *Paul* to *Timothy*. 2 *Tim.* iii. 15. The Scriptures which *Timothy* knew from his childhood were the writings of *Moſes* and the Prophets, not a line of the New Teſtament was written. Does the Ex. think the Old Teſtament alone ſufficient? or does he imagine the very Epiſtle in which the Apoſtle inſtructs

ſtructs his diſciple was not neceſſary? St. *Paul* did not think it uſeleſs or he would not have written it. Why does the Apoſtle ſtrictly command the Theſſalonians to hold faſt the oral traditions, which they had received from him: "Wherefore brethren, ſtand and hold faſt, "*krateite*, the traditions, which you have been taught, "whether by word or by our Epiſtle." 2 *Theſ.* ii. 15. The Apoſtle not only thought but taught expreſsly that the Scriptures were not ſufficient, when he ordered them to hold faſt what they had learned by oral tradition as well as what they read in the Scriptures. The text cited by the Ex. ſhews the ends for which the Scriptures were written, and the advantages reſulting from them when rightly underſtood: "They are "profitable," ſays the Apoſtle, "for reproof, for cor-"rection, for inſtruction in righteouſneſs." Does the Ex. think profitable and ſufficient ſynonomous? Meat is profitable, and even indiſpenſably neceſſary for the ſupport of life and health, but air is equally neceſſary. 'Tis uſeleſs to inſiſt on a truth which even ſtupidity can't miſconceive.

The Ex. adds in italics, "that the man of God "may be perfect, thoroughly furniſhed unto all good "works." He might as well have cited the firſt verſe in *Geneſis* in ſupport of the ſole ſufficiency of the Scriptures: who ever doubted that the Scriptures were uſeful for the perfection of the juſt man, and for his advancement in piety and good works? for what other end were they written or given to the faithful but to contribute to their perfection? is not that the immediate end of the inſtitution of the Sacraments? of the public miniſtry? does not St. *Paul* ſay, "that Paſtors "and teachers are given by Chriſt to his Church for "the perfection of the Saints." *Eph.* iv. Both are therefore neceſſary, or to ſpeak more correctly the Scriptures are uſeful, and the public miniſtry indiſpenſably neceſſary: for without the Scriptures the faithful have been ſanctified before the Scriptures were written

ten, but not without the miniſtry of the Paſtors and teachers. The angel did not refer *Cornelius* the Centurion to the Scriptures, that he might find perfection and ſanctification in them, but ordered him to ſend for St. *Peter* and learn from him what he was to do, "he "will tell you," ſaid the Angel, "what is neceſſary for "you to do." *Acts* x. 6. If the Scriptures were alone ſufficient to perfect and furniſh him to all good works why not tell him ſo? why direct him to learn his duty, not from the Scriptures, but from St. *Peter* the Chief Paſtor of the Church? it ſeems the Angel was ignorant of this new doctrine: he thought, as plain men do now-a-days, that 'twas the duty of the Paſtor to direct the ſheep in the choice of paſture, and not permit them to range at large amongſt poiſonous herbs, and expoſed to ravening wolves or wily foxes.

To expoſe this truth in ſuch a point of view as muſt ſtrike the meaneſt capacity, we ſhall ſubſtitute the Ex. to the Angel, and hear his conference with the Centurion.

Ex. You muſt read the Scriptures; in them you'll find every truth which you are to believe, and every maxim which you are to obſerve.

Corn. What Scriptures?

Ex. Some Books were written long ſince, by authors whom I don't know, they contain the pure word of God.

Corn. How ſhall I know them? you ſay that you don't know the authors. How do you know that they were divinely inſpired?

Ex. A certain taſte will direct you—a certain ſenſation will ſerve to diſcriminate theſe which are divinely inſpired, you'll feel the truth as heat is felt near a fire.

Corn. Hitherto my taſte directed me in the choice of meats, and all my ſenſes ſerved to diſtinguiſh external objects; I find I muſt employ them to ſome other purpoſe. My ſenſes are ſubject to error, more particularly

cularly when diveſted from their proper object. What if they deceive me?

Ex. No.

Corn. Are you infallible?

Ex. No, far from it.

Corn. Then I can have no more dependance on you than on my ſenſes.

Ex. You muſt believe.

Corn. Pardon me Sir, you I will not believe, becauſe you tell me candidly that you may deceive me; my ſenſes I may truſt when confined to their proper object; but if my eye pretended to hear, or my ear to ſee, I ſhould believe neither the one nor the other. Now Sir, that ſuch and ſuch Books are divinely inſpired, and that in this viſible world no other Book is ſo, neither is nor can be the object of my ſenſes. How many Books are canonical?

Ex. That's a ſubject of ſerious diſcuſſion and intricate controverſy.

Corn. In what language are they written?

Ex. Some in Hebrew, ſome in Greek, ſome in Syro-Chaldaic.

Corn. I am a Roman Soldier don't underſtand a word of Hebrew or Greek.

Ex. There are many verſions.

Corn. How many?

Ex. Nine hundred, more or leſs.

Corn. Do they all agree?

Ex. No.

Corn. The tranſlators infallible?

Ex. No.

Corn. The Antographs in being?

Ex. No.

Corn. Any authentic copy in all things agreeable to the original writings?

Ex. No.

Corn. How ſhall I diſtinguiſh the moſt authentic copy from others leſs ſincere? how diſcern all faults in

the verſion? all corruptions and interpolations? where the ſenſe is ambiguous and uncertain how diſcover the intended ſenſe of the author?

Ex. You muſt compare the verſions, in doubtful paſſages, have recourſe to conjecture and rules of interpretation, which we preſcribe.

Corn. What! read them all! compare them all! in difficulties have recourſe to conjecture! the labour is endleſs, and the iſſue uncertain; is there not a more compendious way?

Ex. Yes—take my opinion.

Corn. So ultimately I find I muſt reſt my ſalvation on your opinion, which you ſay is but a meer conjecture. Pardon me Sir—I muſt conſult ſome other guide.——The Angel appears and ſolves all difficulties in three words: ſend for *Peter*, ſays he, and he'll tell you what you have to do. So true it is as St. *Auſtin* remarks that to believe authority is a great abridgement and no labour.

St. *Paul* in this paſſage does not even inſinuate that the Scriptures are a ſufficient rule of faith. His words, if rightly underſtood indicate the contrary—he ſays that the Scriptures are profitable, that the man of God may be perfect. Hence 'tis manifeſt that the man of whom he ſpeaks muſt have been pre-inſtructed in the faith, otherwiſe he would not have been a man of God. The truth is, the Apoſtle's inſtruction was directed to *Timothy* himſelf, and in his perſon to other Prelates; *Timothy* he calls a man of God, and in the text under conſideration he ſays, that the Scriptures are able to make *him Sefophiſai*, who was a man of God wiſe to ſalvation. *Timothy* had been pre-inſtructed by the Apoſtle himſelf; thus we read in the beginning of the foregoing chapter—"Thou, my ſon, "be ſtrengthened in the grace which is in J. Chriſt, "and what you heard from me amongſt many witneſ- "ſes, that commit to faithful man who will be capable "of teaching others."—and in the preceding chapter,

v. 13,

v. 12, he had ſaid, " have the form of ſound words " which you have heard by Me." He does not ſay, which you have read in the Scriptures: the inſpired writings are undoubtedly uſeful to ſuch a man as *Timothy*, pre-inſtructed in the faith by the Paſtors and teachers of the Church, and receiving from them the Scriptures with the ſenſe of the inſpired writings; but that the Scriptures alone without any recourſe to the Paſtors of the Church, were ſufficient to inſtruct a man in faith and morality, St. *Paul* never ſaid; he could not ſay it of the Old Teſtament, the only Scriptures which *Timothy* had known from his childhood, and in which St. *Paul* himſelf, though taught by that famous Doctor *Gamaliel*, had found not life but death, nor was he at his converſion referred by Chriſt himſelf, to the Scriptures, but to the Church in Damaſcus, " go into " the city, and you'll be told what you are to do." *Acts* ix. 16.

The Ex'rs. next argument, if unconnected propoſitions unſupported by proof may be called an argument, tends to ſhew that the Scriptures themſelves are not neceſſary: " Every article of faith," he ſays, " is diſ- " tinctly taught, the exiſtence and attributes of God, " the Trinity, the character of Chriſt, the myſteries of " redemption, the forgiveneſs of ſins, and whatever " elſe has been the ſubject of belief to Chriſtians of all " deſcriptions." It's preſumed the Ex. intended to ſay, *all deſcriptions of Chriſtians*, he had ſaid, *p.* 45, *every man of all religious perſuaſions.* Such men are rare: the writer has not yet ſeen one of them. " This," he ſays, " is admitted by the Church of Rome." The Ex. is deceived or deceives: the Church of Rome admits no ſuch thing: for 'tis an article of faith that the Scriptures are divinely inſpired—that the Goſpels and Canonical Epiſtles contain the word of God—and this is no where taught in the Scriptures; the divinity of Chriſt and his conſubſtantiality with the father, is an article of faith, and this is ſo far from being

distinctly taught in the Scriptures, that the Arians eluded every text of Scripture brought in proof of it. See *Eusebius* of Cæsarea; his Epistle in Theodoret, *B 2 ch.* 12, in which he expounds even the term consubstantial in an arian sense; that there is but one person in Christ, the Nestorians could not see in the Scriptures, nor could the Eutychians discover that in him there are two natures, the divine and human. To come to ourselves we Catholics think transubstantiation clearly revealed in the Scripture, Protestants cannot find it there. Lutherans think consubstantiation distinctly taught, Zuinglians deny it. In a word, there is no description of Christians, who do not find or pretend to find their tenets in Scripture; and as their tenets are in general contradictory, even those which are founded in truth cannot be so distinctly taught as the Ex. pretends.

The Church of Rome makes no changes in her doctrine—she has made no alteration in the Baptismal, the Nicene, and the Athanasian creeds: they are the authentic declarations of the doctrine which she professes, and always professed; she has not borrowed them from the reformed Churches: in her hands they found them, and very injudiciously retain the most solemn condemnation of all their errors:—Thus for example, the day that *Martin Luther* first opposed the established doctrine, he professed his belief in the Nicene Creed, or he did not; if he did not, he was not a Christian; if he did, he believed that there was then in existence, *a Church*; that that Church was *one* that is not divided into different dissenting societies; he believed that 'twas *holy*, that is, that there was no corrupt, impious, or idolatrous doctrines taught in it: for corruption, impiety, and idolatry, exclude *sanctity*; he believed that this Church one and holy was also *Catholic*, that is universal, which universality includes both time and place, it therefore neither could begin with him, nor be confined to him; he believed that this Church was

apostolical,

apoſtolical, that is founded by the Apoſtles, teaching their doctrine, and governed by their ſucceſſors: in no other ſenſe can a Church be called apoſtolical;—hence he muſt have believed that in this Church there were no corrupt doctrines taught, for the Apoſtles taught none, if he did not believe all this he was not a Chriſtian, and if he believed it, and publicly renounced it, he was a perjured Apoſtate. This reaſoning is applicable to every innovator and pretended reformer, from *Simon* the Magician, down to damning *Murray*.

From the extreme ſimplicity of the Chriſtian religion both in faith and morals, the Ex. thinks he knows the ſufficiency of the Scriptures. What! the myſteries of religion ſimple! the myſteries of the Trinity, of the incarnation, of original ſin and predeſtination ſimple! it is apprehended that the Ex. is the firſt man who ever thought them ſo. St. *Paul*, for a ſolution of difficulties to ſome of theſe *ſimple truths*, has recourſe to God's unſearchable ways, and incomprehenſible judgments; *Rom.* xi. 33.—and in another place he declares the neceſſity of captivating the whole force of our underſtanding; 2 *Cor.* x. 5.—Our Ex. has diſcovered that to be extremely ſimple, which St. *Paul* thought beyond the ſphere of human reaſon—how theſe new teachers ſimplify religion!—how far they ſurpaſs the Apoſtles!—'tis true there is nothing more ſimple than to believe that true which tickles our fancy according to the Ex'rs rule of faith.

But in practice at leaſt the morality of the Goſpel is ſimple.—Yes, if we believe theſe men who have reduced it to *caprice* and *fancy*. Theſe two precepts, "thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole "heart and ſoul, and thy neighbour as thyſelf," in which all other precepts are radically contained, and to which they may be reduced, are ſo far from being ſimple, that the Ex. ſays, which bye the bye is a groſs miſtake, that the Goſpel is only a commentary on them. Why not add the Law and the Prophets? of them the Saviour

ſpoke.

ſpoke.—Why not the Acts and Epiſtles of the Apoſtles? why not the commentaries of *Luther*, *Melancton*, *Zuinglius*, &c.? Does the Ex. imagine that two precepts which require commentaries of ſuch magnitude are ſimple? after all, in what part of the Goſpel has he found that the Saviour reduced the whole morality of the Chriſtian religion to the *love of God and the love of Men*, as he ſays, *p.* 53, "the precept of the love of "God, the Saviour ſaid was the firſt and the great "precept, and the precept of loving our neighbour he "ſaid was the ſecond and like the firſt." He did not ſay that there were not other precepts. Were not all his injunctions ſo many indiſpenſable precepts?

The Writer does not clearly underſtand what the Ex. intends by ſaying that outward forms and ceremonies however convenient or decent, are not neceſſary to ſalvation: does he intend to exclude the only two ſacraments, which the reformed Churches have retained, that is, Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper? are not theſe outward ceremonies neceſſary to ſalvation? Infant Baptiſm is declared to be according to the inſtitution of Chriſt by the 37th of the 39th Articles. However in favour of the Ex. we are forced to admit that the framers of the Articles jumbled them together rather haſtily: for if it be true that Baptiſm only confirms faith as 'tis ſaid in that Article, and that by faith alone we are juſtified as the 11th Article expreſsly declared, 'tis falſe that infant Baptiſm is agreeable to Chriſt's inſtitution: for an uſeleſs inſtitution is inconſiſtent with his wiſdom: where there is no faith, there can be no confirmation of faith; infants know nothing, believe nothing, have no faith as faith is defined in the reformed Churches, and to aſſert the contrary is to inſult the common ſenſe of mankind; infant Baptiſm would be therefore an uſeleſs inſtitution, a meer mockery. Add to this that the precept of infant Baptiſm is no where to be be found in the Scriptures: if we underſtand the text as it ſounds, the contrary ſeems to be true,

true, "Going," ſaid the Saviour to the Apoſtles, "teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the "Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt."—*Matt. ult.* 'Twould appear from this text that they were to baptize but thoſe, whom they taught, and as infants are incapable of inſtruction, they ſeem alſo incapable of Baptiſm. For the precept of infant Baptiſm, therefore, recourſe muſt be had to the unwritten word of God, known by the univerſal practice of the Church. A manifeſt proof of the inſufficiency of Scripture is thus taken from the authentic doctrine of the eſtabliſhed Church.

'Tis equally uncertain what the Ex. means, when he ſays, *ibidem* "that human wiſdom and diſcretion are "ſufficient to determine, who are the proper perſons "to perform the office of public prayers." Does he intend to exclude the miniſtry from the Church as well as the Sacraments? in this for once he is conſiſtent with himſelf: for if the Sacraments be not neceſſary to ſalvation, public miniſters to adminiſter the Sacraments are uſeleſs. He admits ſome proper perſons to diſcharge the duty of public prayer.—True; but he has not told us how theſe perſons are to be appointed, by whom, or by what authority; nor does he tell us what are the powers of theſe *proper perſons*, or if they poſſeſs any power at all; and inſtead of referring us to the Scriptures for all theſe things, which we ought to know, he refers us to our own diſcretion.

In the next paragraph he acknowledges that there are difficulties and obſcurities in the Scriptures; but, ſays he, they are confined to ſpeculative points, all eſſential doctrines are clearly revealed. The Writer was yet to learn that ſpeculative points are not eſſential doctrines. What! the myſtery of the Trinity, the divinity of J. Chriſt and of the Holy Ghoſt not eſſential doctrines! theſe are ſpeculative points if any ſuch there be.

In a long and confuſed paragraph the Ex. ſtates that

" that there are in the Scriptures many obſcurities, " ſome intended by the writers, and others from the " imperfection of human nature, and that even enthu- " ſiaſtic brethren pervert ſome of the cleareſt to their " own deſtruction," From this we Catholics logically infer the neceſſity of a more intelligible guide. The Ex. by a ſort of reaſoning, to which the world was hitherto a ſtranger, infers that theſe obſcurities can be no impediment to ſalvation. Why then has he told us that enthuſiaſtic brethren pervert them to their own perdition? is that obſcurity which is the ſource of perdition to ſo many enthuſiaſtics no impediment to ſalvation? The Ex. replies that the Prophets and Apoſtles would not ſay that the Scriptures were ſufficient for that purpoſe if their obſcurity could be any obſtacle. The Prophets and Apoſtles ſay no ſuch thing: the Prophets in doubtful caſes and obſcurities refer contending parties to the deciſion of the High Prieſt, who was Chief Paſtor of the Jewiſh Church.—*Deut.* xiii. And in the prophecy of *Malachi* we read, " the lips " of the Prieſt ſhall preſerve knowledge, and they ſhall " ſeek the law from his mouth. Becauſe he is the " meſſenger of the Lord of Hoſts. *Chi ſipthei Cohen* " *jiſmerou dahath vethorath jibakſhou miphihou chi* " *Maleak jehovah hou.*"—*C.* ii. 7. And the Apoſtles by precept and example refer all difficulties and obſcurities to the deciſion of the Paſtors of the Chriſtian Church: thus the Paſtors aſſembled and decided a moſt difficult and obſcure queſtion—Whether the Law of Circumciſion obliged in the Chriſtian diſpenſation;—*Acts* xv. and St. *Paul* ſays, " that Chriſt has given to " his Church Paſtors and teachers." He at the ſame time aſſigns the end for which theſe Paſtors and teachers are given to the Church, " for the perfecting of the " Saints, for the work of the miniſtry, for the edify- " ing of the myſtical body of Chriſt." The Apoſtle continues to ſhew that they are to continue till time ſhall be no more, and expreſsly declares the reaſon, " that

" that henceforth," ſays he, " we be no more like " children, toſſed to and fro and carried about with " every wind of doctrine, by the ſlight of cunning men " lying in wait to deceive us." *Eph.* iv. In his Epiſtle to *Timothy* he calls the Church, the pillar and ground of truth " *ſtulos kai édraiôma tés aletheias.*"—iii. 15. Hence in his Epiſtle to the Hebrews he orders them to obey their Spiritual Guides, xiii. 17. of theſe ſame Guides he had ſaid *v.* 7. " remember your Guides,"—" *tenémoneu te tô négoumenon úmon*—who ſpoke to you " the word of God, imitate their faith."

The next text cited by the Ex. makes directly againſt him, " if our Goſpel be hid, 'tis hid to them, who " periſh, in whom the God of the world hath blinded " the minds of them who believe not, leaſt the glorious " goſpel of Chriſt ſhould ſhine unto them." 2 *Cor.* iv. 34. The Apoſtle does not ſpeak a word of the Scriptures: he juſtifies the truth and ſincerity of the doctrine which he preached, againſt falſe teachers, who traduced him, and he calls that doctrine which he delivered in his public lectures, *the Glorious Goſpel of Chriſt*, ſo true it is, that the unwritten word is a part of the Goſpel of Chriſt as well as the written word; he adds that if the light of the Goſpel did not ſhine to ſome through his preaching, 'twas becauſe their minds were faſcinated by a love of the world: " We," continued the Apoſtle, " preach not ourſelves, but J. Chriſt our Lord, and " ourſelves, your ſervants by J. Chriſt."

The Ex. cites ſome verſes from the Pſalms, to what purpoſe the writer cannot conjecture. The Pſalmiſt ſays, " thy word is a lamp to my feet, and a light to " my path." 109. Who doubts it? the commandment of the Lord is pure enlightening the eyes, 19. That's unqueſtionably true. The man who does not walk in the commandments of God, and according to the precepts of his law, muſt walk in darkneſs. What relation has this to the ſubject in debate? does the Ex. pretend that the Scriptures written in *David's* time are

a ſufficient rule of faith? that they contain all the truths which we Chriſtians are to believe, and all the rules of morality, which we are to practiſe? if ſo, the whole New Teſtament is uſeleſs. The Pſalmiſt praiſes the beauties and ſanctity of the divine law, of which no Chriſtian ever doubted—does not ſay a word of the ſufficiency of Scripture as a rule of faith; nor does he ſpeak of the Scripture at all: for the law of God, his precepts and his commandments were ſtrictly obſerved before there was a line of the Scriptures written: thus we read in the book of Geneſis: "Becauſe *Abraham* obeyed my precepts, and command-"ments, and obſerved my ceremonies and laws."—xxvi. 5. The intelligent reader need not be informed that the book of Geneſis was written by *Moſes* one of *Abraham's* deſcendants, ſome 400 years after the death of that patriarch in whoſe time we know of no Scripture; and all who believed in God, and ſerved him, muſt have founded theirfaith and practice on the unwritten word of God, what we call oral tradition. So unlucky is this Ex. in his choſe of texts to ſupport his pretended ſufficiency of Scripture, to direct us in the paths of Salvation, that in their intended ſignification, they uniformly teach the contrary. A cauſe muſt be totally defenceleſs when its beſt choſen proofs are againſt it. His laſt argument evinces this truth beyond a contradiction "it is ſcarcely credible, ſays he, p. 55." "that the Goſpel, which was preached to the poor, "to the ignorant and to the unlearned, ſhould have "been beyond common comprehenſion." The immediate inference from this argument, which the Ex. unfortunately overlooked, or perhaps did not think proper to make, for reaſons known to himſelf, is that the Goſpel was preached to the ignorant and unlearned, and delivered to them by oral tradition, not in writing which they could not read; that they were referred to Paſtors for inſtruction both in faith and morality, not to the Scriptures, which to them would have been abſolutely

ſolutely unintelligible and totally uſeleſs: the Art of Printing was not known for many centuries after the eſtabliſhment of the Chriſtian Church; of the poor, the ignorant and unlearned, to whom the Goſpel was preached, not one of a thouſand knew how to read, and not one of fifty thouſand could procure a manuſcript copy of the Scriptures; to refer theſe men to the Scriptures as a rule of faith would have been farcical, and to pretend that J. Chriſt had given them no rule of faith at all, is blaſphemy.

The Ex. having proved, as he pretends that the infallibity of the Romiſh Church is incredible, that is, without offering any argument but theſe, of which we have already ſhewn the futility, he gravely tells us, that he has proved a truth, which the whole Chriſtian world believed for fifteen centuries, and which a great majority of Chriſtians continues to believe to be incredible, condeſcends at length to diſcuſs the texts which Mr. B. produced in ſupport of this doctrine.

If by the Romiſh Church the Ex. underſtands that portion of the Catholic Church, which is within the limits of the city of Rome, or that dioceſs, or even within the Pope's territories, the Romiſh Church is not even mentioned in Mr. B's Letter of Inſtruction; if by the Romiſh Church he underſtands the Catholic Church in communion with the See of Rome, ſome texts were cited in that Letter, not in ſupport of the Church's infallibility but of her indefectility; 'tis true the one is eſſentially connected with the other, and by confounding them the Ex. ruins his own cauſe: for the indefectibility of the Church, is believed and publicly profeſſed by the eſtabliſhed Church of England, though the infallibility of which 'tis the natural conſequence be denied: in the 16th *Homily*, it is expreſsly declared "that the Holy Ghoſt, the ſpirit of truth has been and "will be always preſent with the Church, *governing* "and *directing* it to the world's end; ſo that it never "has wanted, nor ever will want while the world en-

 dures,

" dures, pure and ſound doctrine; the ſacraments mi-
" niſtered according to Chriſt's holy inſtitution, and the
" right uſe of eccleſiaſtical diſcipline."

'Tis true the framers of the thirty nine Articles, theſe maſter-builders of this new edifice, the Church of England, found it convenient to give the Holy Ghoſt an aſſiſtant inſtructor and director in the Church, that is, the ſpirit of error—and of all others the moſt abominable the *ſpirit* of *idolatry*, declaring that the Church was for 800 years and more buried in abominable idolatry. How the Holy Ghoſt the ſpirit of truth ſettled matters with his aſſiſtant inſtructor and governor, the *Spirit of Error*, we leave the Manicheans to decide.

The framers of the Articles were betrayed into this unpardonable inconſiſtency by a ſervile imitation of the capital reformers in the confeſſion of *Ausbourg*, of all confeſſions publiſhed by the reformed Churches the moſt authentic; or to ſpeak correctly, the only one authentic, though it has been ſince reformed more than once. The viith. Article ſtates:—" *That there is a* " *Holy Church, which will remain for ever; but the* " *Church is the Aſſembly of Saints, in which the Goſ-* " *pel is taught and the Sacraments duly adminiſtered.*" The reader will pleaſe to remark that the reformers had not yet aſſumed the name of Proteſtants, or ſeparated themſelves by any authentic act or declaration from the Catholic Church, when this confeſſion of faith was ſubſcribed and preſented to *Charles* V. in 1530. This they themſelves acknowledge in cloſing the expoſition of their doctrine: " ſuch," ſay they, " is the abridgement of our faith, in which no-
" thing will be ſeen contrary to the Scripture, nor to
" the Catholic Church, nor even to the Roman Church,
" as far as it can be known by its writers. The diſ-
" pute rolls *il ſágil*, on ſome trifling abuſes which have
" been introduced into the Churches without any cer-
" tain authority, and though there be ſome difference,
" it ought to be tolerated: becauſe 'tis not neceſſary

" that

" the rites of Churches be in all places the ſame."—*Conf. Aug. Art.* 22. *Edit. Gen. p.* 22 & 23. The viith. Article already cited, is manifeſtly ſubverſive of the whole reformation; on it Catholics propoſed ſome very embarraſſing queſtions, to which no ſatisfactory anſwer has been, or ever will be given: if, ſaid they, " the Church be holy why do you pretend that there is " ſuperſtition and idolatry taught and practiſed in it?" Idolatry and ſanctity are as oppoſite as light and darkneſs. If the Church be the Aſſembly of Saints, why do you ſeparate yourſelves from it? to ſeparate yourſelves from the Aſſembly of the Saints is to acknowledge yourſelves impious.

Theſe texts which Mr. *B.* did not produce in his Letter of Inſtruction, the Writer begs leave to inſert for the entire ſatisfaction of the Ex. and his *powerful Ally.* In the next edition of the Examination a refutation will be expected, or a candid acknowledgment that a new ſyſtem founded on miſrepreſentation, and ſubſtituted to the primitive faith of Chriſtians, muſt be ſupported by the ſame means, which gave it birth.

The Writer thinks it neceſſary to inform his reader, that he does not vouch for the accuracy of the Proteſtant verſion of the Bible, though he takes ſome texts from it. The tranſlators themſelves honeſtly acknowledge that they have had recourſe to conjecture. A man's credit muſt be low indeed when 'tis not evidence againſt himſelf; he alſo premiſes that he promiſcuouſly cites theſe texts of the Old and New Teſtament, which clearly announce the indefectibility, perpetual viſibility and infallibility of Chriſt's Church on earth for theſe attributes of the Church are inſeparably connected, as will be ſhewn in the courſe of the work; he does not enquire whether the Church of Chriſt be the Roman Church, or the Engliſh Church, or a Church of any other denomination: ſuch an enquiry is uſeleſs: for if it be incontrovertibly true that the Church of Chriſt is and was perpetually viſible, ſince the publication of the New

New Law on the day of Pentecoſt, all the different ſocieties, which have ſince been formed; all the Churches whoſe commencement is fixed by Catholics to a later date, and admitted by the members of theſe Churches to have commenced at that time in their preſent form, are manifeſtly no parts nor portions of the *one* Church of Chriſt at all times and without any ceſſation viſible.

The firſt text is cited from the prophecy of *Iſaias*, ii. 2. The title of this chapter in the Proteſtant verſion admits that the prophet ſpeaks of Chriſt's kingdom.—By Chriſt's kingdom all Chriſtians underſtand his Church. The Jews vainly imagined that the promiſed Meſſias would be a temporal Prince, and that he would re-eſtabliſh the Jewiſh monarchy in its former ſplendor. 'Tis preſumed that the Ex'rs opinion does not coincide with this Jewiſh fancy, " and it ſhall come " to paſs," ſays the Prophet, " in the laſt days, that " the mountain of the Lord's houſe ſhall be eſtabliſhed " in the top of the mountains, and ſhall be exalted " above the hills, and all nations ſhall flow unto it; " and many peoples will come and ſay, let us go up to " the mountain of the Lord, to the houſe of the God " of Jacob, and *He* will teach us *rejorenou* his ways, " and we will walk in his paths, becauſe from Sion " will go out the law *thorah* and the word of God from " Jeruſalem, and *he* will judge amongſt the Gentiles."

The Prophet in terms as ſtrongly expreſſive as language can afford announces the viſibility, the univerſability and infallibility of Chriſt's Church. 'Tis *viſibility*: Nothing can be more viſible than a mountain elevated on the ſummit of mountains, the man muſt be blind indeed, who does not ſee it; its *univerſality*, " all nations ſhall flow to it, the Pſalmiſt had " ſaid:" " he ſhall rule from ſea to ſea and from the " river (Jordan) to the ends of the earth," *Pſ.* 71. *Hebr.* 72. v. 8. and v. 11th, " all Kings ſhall adore " him, and all nations ſhall ſerve him. And v. 17.

" Let

" Let his name be for ever, his name is eſtabliſhed be-
" fore the Sun, in him *all nations* are bleſſed." Theſe words of the Pſalmiſt require no comment: they cannot be applied but to the Saviour, 'tis ſimply a repetition of the promiſe made to *Abraham*, xii. 3. & xxvi. 4. *Gen.* " in thy ſeed ſhall *all the nations of the earth* " *be bleſſed.*" In this ſenſe St. *Paul* underſtood it, ſee his Epiſtle to the Galatians third chapter. In theſe texts and other ſimilar, of the Old Teſtament the univerſality of Chriſt's Church is ſo diſtinctly foretold that 'tis an article inſerted in the baptiſmal creed, commonly called the Apoſtles creed: " *I believe in the* " *Holy Catholic Church.*" That this univerſality includes both time and place and excludes every error we ſhall ſee preſently: in the text cited from the prophecy of *Iſaias* 'tis ſaid " let us aſcend to the houſe of the God " of *Jacob*, and *He* will teach us his ways." St. *Paul* atteſts that the Church is the Houſe of God. 1. *Tim.* iii. 15. 'Tis therefore God himſelf who teaches in his Church by the miniſtry of theſe teachers and Paſtors, whom he has deputed for the perfection of the Saints. *Eph.* iv. Of this truth we have the expreſs teſtimony of the Apoſtle " we are the Ambaſſadors of " Chriſt." " *uper Chriſtou oun preſbuómen.*" 2. *Cor.* v. 20. " As God exhorting by us *òs theou parakalountos* " *di èmón:*" This is manifeſtly a conſequence of that authentic promiſe, which Chriſt made to his Apoſtles, that he would be with them teaching and baptiſing to the end of time. *Matt. ult.*

God, whether he teaches immediately by himſelf, as when viſible here on earth, or by his miniſters, as ſince his aſcenſion, teaches no errors at all. Would the Ex. or his Ally condeſcend to inform us on what authority the framers of the articles gave to J. Chriſt, an aſſiſtant inſtructor to teach idolatry and other damnable errors in his Church?

In the paſſage of *Iſaias* under conſideration 'tis ſaid " the law will go out from Sion" " *cai mitſion théthè* " *thorah.*"

" *thorah*." The Hebrew term *thorah* is in a particular manner applied to the law of *Moſes*, including all the ceremonies, rites and obſervances of the Jewiſh worſhip, hence 'tis ſaid that *Joſue*, after having made a covenant with the children of *Iſrael* their God " wrote " all theſe things in the book of the law of God." " *Beſepher thorath Elohim*." The law therefore of which the Prophet ſpeaks is manifeſtly the new law in contradiſtinction to the old, given by an Angel through the miniſtry of *Moſes*; this law went out from Sion, and the word of God from Jeruſalem by the preaching of the Apoſtles, who commenced their miſſion there; to fulfil the prophecy it muſt extend to all nations, which will flow to this *Houſe of God* like the waters of a great river " *naharou elaio chal goiim*." Of this truth we have the teſtimony of Chriſt himſelf, when after having opened the diſciples mind to underſtand the Scriptures, he told them that penance and remiſſions of ſins in the name of Chriſt, muſt be preached to *all nations* beginning from Jeruſalem. *Luke ult.* Here we have univerſality of place in expreſs terms; and we find univerſality of time as ſtrongly expreſſed: for as the preaching of the Goſpel did not, nor could not come to all nations at the ſame time, it muſt come in the courſe of time; and the Saviour himſelf fixes the limit at the conſummation of time: " this Goſpel of " the kingdom of God, ſaid he, will be preached in the " whole world, and then the end will come :" *tote ĕxei to telos. Matt.* xxiv. 14. If the Ex. will have the complaiſance to admit that Chriſt's preſcience could extend to the end of time, his wiſdom deviſe means to fulfil his promiſe, and his power employ theſe means, the controverſy is at an end: for Chriſt ſays, in language as diſtinctly intelligible as ever was penned —That his Goſpel would be preached to all nations; that this preaching would continue to the end of time; that he himſelf would be with the preachers of his Goſpel all days *paſas ĕmeras* without interruption till the

the conſummation the Prophet ſays that 'tis he himſelf who will teach us *vejorenou*, as he does not teach by himſelf he muſt by his miniſters or he has broken his promiſe, and the prophet has deceived us. To aſſert either, is blaſphemy; and to pretend that he teaches error or permits an aſſiſtant inſtructor to teach error in his Church is ſomething worſe than blaſphemy. So much for the firſt text, let us paſs to the ſecond. 'Tis the ixth. of *Iſaias*. This chapter is underſtood of Chriſt's ſpiritual kingdom by all Chriſtians; the title of the chapter in the Jewiſh edition of the Hebrew Bible, with Maſſoretic points, is, "the promiſe of a "more happy age under a Great King:" "of the en- "creaſe of his Government and Peace there ſhall be "*no end* upon the throne of *David*, and upon his king- "dom, to order it and eſtabliſh it with judgement and "with juſtice from henceforth and for ever, the zeal "of the Lord of Hoſts will perform this." In theſe expreſſive terms the Prophet declares: that there will be *no end to the encreaſe* of Chriſt's kingdom nor to the peace and harmony which he will eſtabliſh within his kingdom: *Lemarebeth ha miſrah ve le ſhalom ein Kets*. Confirming it *le hachin othah*; and founding it *ve le ſehadah* in judgment and juſtice from now *me hattah* and for ever *ve ad holam* this confirmation of the Church, or Chriſt's ſpiritual kingdom, in judgment and juſtice forever the Prophet aſcribes to the zeal of the Lord of Hoſts: *kinaath Jehovah tsiboath thahoſeh zoth*, and he excludes the moſt diſtant idea of any interruption or intermiſſion. Saying, from now *meattha* and for ever *ve ad holem*. Does the Ex. figure to himſelf that errors in faith are conſiſtent with *judgment* and *juſtice?* that an interruption of 800 years is compatible with that permanent peace and unceaſing encreaſe of Chriſt's kingdom which the prophet promiſes for which he gives the power of God as ſecurity?

In the 54th chapter the Prophet ſpeaks in terms of admiration of the univerſality of Chriſt's Church.

The title in the Jewiſh edition prefixed to this chapter is, "The extent and ſecurity of the new ſtate." St. *Paul* in his Epiſtle to the Galatians, iv. 27. cites the firſt verſe of this chapter to ſhew that we Chriſtians are the brethren of *Iſaac* according to the promiſe as children of the Church of the Gentiles which was in being before the ſynagogue was inſtituted; but then deſerted for a time, that is, during the continuance of the ſynagogue, and hence is called in that chapter a widow—either St. *Paul* miſtook the intended ſenſe of the Prophet, or *Iſaias* in that chapter addreſſes himſelf to the Church of Chriſt: "Give praiſe," ſays he, ". . . . . for many are the children of the deſolate "more than of the married wife . . . . . enlarge the "place of thy tents . . . . . ſpare not for thou ſhalt "break forth on the right hand and on the left, and "thy ſeed ſhall inherit Nations . . . . fear not for thou "ſhalt not be confounded nor bluſh . . . . . for he who "hath made thee ſhall rule over thee *Baalika* the Lord "of Hoſts is his name, and thy Redeemer the holy one "of Iſrael ſhall be called the God of *all the earth* . . . . "this thing is to me as in the days of *Noah* to whom "I ſwore that I would no more bring the waters of "*Noah* upon the earth, ſo I have ſworn not to be angry "with thee, and not to rebuke thee: for the moun-"tains ſhall be moved and the earth ſhall tremble, but "my mercy ſhall not depart from thee, and the co-"venant of my peace ſhall not be moved, ſaith the "Lord; who hath mercy on thee:" A comment on this paſſage would rather tend to obſcure than elucidate the ſenſe of it:—the prophet ſays, "that the Redeem-"er will be acknowledged *God of all the Earth*; that he will govern his Church with the care and attention with which a huſband rules his wife: "*Baalika*," that the Covenant which he makes with her ſhall never ceaſe, nor his mercy depart from her.—She will therefore exiſt under his immediate direction till the end of time. All attempts to deſtroy a Church under the immediate

immediate protection of Almighty Power are ineffectual. Hence the Saviour says that, " the Gates is, that " the powers of Hell will not prevail against her."—*Matt.* xvi. 12. *Isaias* had said in the same chapter, *v.* 17. " every weapon which is formed against thee " shall miss, and every tongue which rises in judg- " ment against thee, thou shalt condemn." If the first reformer had weighed well the force of this promise he would have seen that as he himself did not compose the Church to which the promise was made, his opposition to her established doctrine placed him evidently amongst these tongues, which rise up in judgment against her, and that of course, she would condemn him. This reasoning is applicable to every innovator, who has formed a party since the Apostles' days. The argument is insoluble if the Ex. will admit that the promise was made to the Catholic Church; if he denies it, let him assign some other Church visible since the Apostles' days, without interruption or intermission.

St. *Paul* to the Romans, xi. 26, cites the 20th, and 21st, verses of the 59th chapter of *Isaias*, to shew that after the fulness of the nations should come in then Israel would be saved. This passage therefore must be understood of Christ's Church, and his Church must continue visible till the plenitude of nations have entered that the Jews then remaining may be united to it, or as the Apostle expresses it, be engrafted on it. 'Tis ridiculous to pretend that they should unite in communion with an invisible Church—the title of this chapter in the Protestant version is, " Christ's covenant " with his Church." " There shall come," says the Prophet, " a Redeemer to Sion and to these, who re- " turn from iniquity in *Jacob*, saith the Lord: this is " my covenant with them, saith the Lord, my spirit " which is over thee, and my words, which I have " put in thy mouth, shall not depart from thy mouth, " nor from the mouth of thy seed, nor from the mouth

" of thy ſeed's ſeed, ſaith the Lord, from henceforth and " for ever. *Iſ.* ix. 20, 21. Here we have the moſt expreſs and intelligible declaration that the Spirit of the Lord is with his Church; that his words are in her mouth, not errors nor fictions, but his truth: for he is the God of truth, and by her mouth he teaches as he did the primitive Chriſtians by the mouth of the Apoſtles; and his words are in the mouth of her ſeed, that is, in the mouth of the immediate ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles whom they ſpiritually begot by the word of God, as St. *Paul* ſays: " In J. Chriſt, by the Goſpel I have " begotten ye:"—" *engar Chriſto Jeſo dia tou Evange-* " *lion Egoumus egeneſa*;" 1 *Cor.* iv. 15. and in the mouth of their ſeed's ſeed, that is in the mouth of theſe who were ſpiritually begotten by the immediate ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles, and ſo on, ſays the prophet from now and for ever *meattha ve ad holam.* If this be not a poſitive declaration on the part of God by his Prophet that the Church to the end of time will continue to teach his words under the direction of his divine ſpirit, the Writer does not underſtand the force of language. However, for the greater ſatisfaction of the Ex. and his Ally, he begs to introduce a ſpeaker of high authority on this ſubject: J. Chriſt himſelf ſays that his divine ſpirit will inherit his Church and remain with her till the conſummation: " I will aſk the " Father and he will give you another Paraclete that " he may remain with you for ever, *eis aiona:* the " ſpirit of truth." *John* xiv. 16. The Apoſtles were not to continue in this world for ever, the ſpirit of truth muſt therefore continue with them in their ſucceſſors. The Saviour aſſigns the end for which this ſpirit of truth is ſent: " when he comes the ſpirit of " truth he will lead you *odegeſei* into all truth. *John* xvi. 13. He had ſaid, *John* xvi. 26, " the Paraclete, " the H. Ghoſt, whom the father will ſend in my name, " will teach you all things and bring to your memory " all the things which I have ſaid to you. From this

paſſage

paſſage 'tis manifeſt that the end for which the Holy Ghoſt preſides over the Apoſtles in their ſucceſſors the Paſtors of Chriſt's Church, is to inſtruct them in the truths of religion; theſe truths which Chriſt himſelf revealed, which without the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, would have been forgotten *úpemnéſei úmas.* He will remind you ſays the Saviour. If the Ex. imagines that errors in faith are conſiſtent with this promiſed aſſiſtance and ſpecial protection of the Holy Ghoſt, he muſt permit us Catholics to believe St. *Paul*, who is of a contrary opinion: "what union," ſays the Apoſtle, "between light and darkneſs? what "agreement between Chriſt and *Belial?* or what "part has the believer with the infidel? and what "agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for "for you are the temple of the living God, as God "ſaith, I will dwell in them and walk amongſt them, "and I will be their God and they ſhall be my peo-"ple." 2 *Cor.* vi. 14, 15. 'Tis beyond a contradiction that the Apoſtle in this paſſage ſpeaks of the Church of J. Chriſt, in which he admits the immediate preſence of God as in his temple, from which his truth excludes every ſhade of error, as light expels darkneſs, and as faith effaces infidelity.

In the 60th chapter of his prophecy, *Iſaias*, ſpeaking of the glory of Chriſt's Church, ſays that, "Its "gates are always open; that they will not be ſhut "night or day, that the ſtrength of nations may be "brought into it, and their Kings adduced to it." 11. v. And he concludes thus, "the nation and "kingdom that will not ſerve thee ſhall periſh." 12. v. In the next chapter the prophet introduces the Redeemer ſpeaking, if we believe St. *Luke*, or rather J. Chriſt himſelf, who after reading the firſt verſe of that chapter in the ſynagogue, ſaid, "this day the pro-"phecy is fulfilled in your ears." *Luke* iv. 19. In the 8th verſe of the prophecy we read, "becauſe I "the Lord love judgment and hate rapine in the whole "burnt-

" burnt-offering; I will give their work in *truth*, and " make a *perpetual covenant* with them." The truth therefore ſhall never depart from them. The language of the prophet is ſo ſtrongly expreſſive that a comment would only diminiſh the force of it. Let us paſs from *Iſaias* to another prophet of equal authority.

Jeremias ſays: *Jer.* xxxi. 34, &c. " Behold the " days will come ſaith the Lord, and I will make a " new covenant with the houſe of Iſrael and with the " houſe of Juda; not according to the covenant which " I made with their fathers on the day when I took " them by the hand to bring them out of the land of " Egypt, which they broke; .... this is the cove- " nant which I will make with the houſe of Iſrael after " theſe days ſaith the Lord: I will give my law *tho-* " *rathi* in their bowels *Bequirbam*, and on their heart " will I write it, and I will be to them a God and they " will be to me a people ..... thus ſaith the " Lord, who gives the Sun to enlighten the day and " the order of the moon and ſtars to enlighten the " night, who ſtirreth up the ſea and its waves reſound, " the Lord of Hoſts is his name: if theſe ordinances " ſhall fail before me, ſaith the Lord, then alſo the " ſeed of Iſrael ſhall fail ſo as not to be a nation be- " fore me for ever." In the enſuing chapter, *v.* 40. the Lord ſays by his prophet, " and I will make " an *everlaſting covenant* with them, and will " not ceaſe to do them good." If the Ex. can prevail on himſelf to believe that St. *Paul* underſtood the Prophet's meaning, we find him explain this promiſe of the New Teſtament or the New Covenant of Chriſt with his Church: from this very text the Apoſtle infers that the Covenant made with the ſynagogue was declared old and conſequently on the point of being aboliſhed, ſee his Epiſtle to the Hebrews, viii. *chap.* Does the Ex. know of any covenant, which is to ſucceed the New? does he find in any part of the ſcriptures that the New Covenant was to be ſucceeded by another?

another? if not he muſt admit that 'twill continue to the end of time, and whilſt it continues J. Chriſt will write his law in the hearts of his people; his divine grace will enlighten their underſtanding and direct their will. A law thus written is not eaſily effaced. The intelligent reader need not be informed that the promiſes made to the Houſe of Iſrael and Juda, and the city of Jeruſalem are underſtood of the Chriſtian Church; and the uninformed Chriſtian may reſt ſatisfied with the authority of St. *Paul*—in the fourth chapter of his Epiſtle to the Romans the Apoſtle ſhews that the promiſe was made to *Abraham* before he was circumciſed, that he of courſe is father of all the faithful whether of the circumciſion or not:—"Who is father of us all: as it is written: becauſe I have placed thee father of many nations." *ver.* 16.—and yet more expreſsly to the Galatians, iii. 29. "if you be "of J. Chriſt, therefore you are the ſeed of *Abraham*, "heirs according to the promiſe;" and again iv. 28. "we are the brethren according to *Iſaac*, the children of the promiſe."

The Prophet *Ezekiel* ſpeaks of the ſpiritual duration of Chriſt's Church in terms energetic: "My ſervant "*David* ſhall be King over them, and one ſhepherd "over them all . . . . . and I will make a covenant of peace with them, and an eternal covenant "'twill be to them, *Bereth holam jehejeh otham*, and "I will eſtabliſh them and multiply them, and I will "place my ſanctuary in the midſt of them forever." *Ez.* xxxvii. 26.—In alluſion to this promiſe the Saviour ſaid: "I have other ſheep which are not of this fold, (the ſynagogue) theſe I muſt bring; they will "hear my voice; there will be one flock and one "ſhepherd." *John* x. 16. 'Tis well known that the Saviour whilſt viſible here on earth did not preach to the heathen nations; in the words of his miniſters they hear his voice and are collected into his fold. So

true

true it is that 'tis he himſelf who teaches his ways in his Church as the Prophet *Iſaias* ſays, *vejorenou.*

Words cannot more diſtinctly mark the unſhaken ſtability of Chriſt's Church or his ſpiritual kingdom than theſe of the Prophet *Daniel.*—" In the days of " theſe kingdoms the God of Heaven will raiſe a " kingdom which will not be diſſipated." *Dan.* ii. 49. In alluſion to this St. *Paul* ſays that, " J. Chriſt muſt " reign till he puts all enemies under his feet, the laſt " enemy deſtroyed is death." 1 *Cor.* xv. 25. If J. Chriſt be a King to reign over his kingdom, as St. *Paul* ſays, till death be abſorpt in victory, which will not happen before the reſurrection; if he be a ſhepherd as he ſays himſelf, will the Ex. or ſome of his friends be good enough to inform us what became of his kingdom before that invincible hero *Martin Luther* reinſtated him on his throne? was he a king without a kingdom, a meer pretender, a ſhepherd without a flock? God ſaid by his Prophet *Ezekiel*: " I will " raiſe over them one ſhepherd, my ſervant *David*, " *He* will feed them, and he will be to them a ſhep- " herd. I the Lord will be their God, and my ſervant " *David* a prince, in the midſt of them, I the Lord " have ſaid it, I will make with them a covenant of " peace and I will expel evil beaſts from the earth." *Ezek.* xxxiv.

In the prophecy of *Jeremy* we read, " I will give " paſtors according to my heart, and they will feed " you with doctrine and ſcience." *Jer.* iii. 15. In alluſion to theſe promiſes the Saviour ſays of himſelf, " I am the good ſhepherd, I know my ſheep and my " ſheep know me . . . . . my ſheep hear my voice; " and I know them, and they follow me . . . . . and " no man ſhall take them out of my hand." *John* x. The Scriptures both Old and New repreſent the Saviour as a ſhepherd feeding his flock. By what means or by what extraordinary power was he robbed of his flock?

flock? he himſelf declared that no man ſhould take them out of his hands. The Ex. will excuſe a reflexion, which naturally preſents itſelf, during them memorable days of Popiſh ignorance and ſuperſtition—during them 800 years in which the Church was immerſed in abominable idolatry and taught fundamental errors in faith, where was the flock which J. Chriſt fed with doctrine and ſcience? Papiſts, if we believe the framers of the thirty-nine articles, whoſe opinion the Ex. muſt adopt, were idolaters. J. Chriſt does not teach idolaters, nor does he feed an idolatrous flock. Proteſtants he did not teach: for there were none before the reformation in 1517. The firſt reformers did not even pretend that there was a kingdom or ſtate, a city, town, or country village on earth, in which the reformed doctrine was taught before their own time: the father of this pretended reformation, *Luther*, poſitively aſſerts that he himſelf commenced it, and complains bitterly that *Zuinglius* had the aſſurance to conteſt this prerogative with him. *Zuinglius* had ſaid in the explanation of the 18th article, that before the name of *Luther* was known, he himſelf had preached the Goſpel, that is the reformation, in Switzerland. *Luther*, not overſtocked with patience at any time, was exaſperated beyond meaſure at this attempt to rob him of the glory of beginning the reformation; he wrote to the people of Straſburgh "that he dared to "glory in having firſt preached Jeſus Chriſt; but that "*Zuinglius* wiſhed to deprive him of that glory. How, "continues this zealous patriarch, to be ſilent when "men diſturb our churches and attack our authority? "if they be not deſirous of weakening their own au- "thority they ought not to weaken ours." And in the concluſion he ſays, "there is no mean, that either they "or he himſelf are miniſters of Satan." *Tom.* ii. *Jen. Epi.* 202.

If pride, arrogance, perjury and ſenſuality qualify a man for ſuch a miniſtry, his title was not defective;

nor was that of his adverſary. The reader will pardon this digreſſion.

The Lord by his prophet *Oſee*, after having foretold the reprobation of the Jewiſh ſynagogue under the figure of a diſloyal wife, promiſes to eſpouſe the Chriſtian church in perpetual love: "I will betroth thee to "to me for ever; and I will betroth thee to me "in juſtice and in judgment, and in loving kindneſs "and in tender mercies, and I will betroth thee to me "in faith, and thou ſhalt know that I am the Lord." *Oſee*, ii. 19. That this prophecy is underſtood of the Chriſtian church we know from St. *Paul*, who in the xth. to the *Romans*, cites ſome verſes of it to prove the vocation of the Gentiles; and from St. *Peter*, who quotes it to the ſame purpoſe.—2. *Pet.* ii. 10. The Ex. will ſurely admit that God betrothing the Church to himſelf, or, as the Hebrew text expreſſes it, uniting it to himſelf as to its head *ve ereſthick*; and that in judgment, in juſtice and faith forever, *le holam* will preſerve his Church from damnable errors: damnable errors are incompatible with judgment, juſtice, and true faith.

The Writer paſſes many texts of the Old Teſtament unnoticed; has adduced but theſe for which the authors of the New Teſtament are vouchers. Our Ex. will have the condeſcenſion to admit the truth of their interpretation: 'tis not founded on conjecture or the uſual modes of interpretation, which this learned Ex. recommends to the illiterate as well as the learned, that is to men and women who don't know what the term *interpretation* ſignifies. 'Tis telling a blind man that he wants no guide to conduct him through an intricate and dangerous paſſage in which a falſe ſtep leads him to a precipice, and terminates in deſtruction.

Let us now conſult the New Teſtament, and ſee if it be more favourable to the Ex'rs pretenſions.

The firſt is that which Mr. B. adduced in his Letter of Inſtruction. Chriſt ſays to *Peter*, "Thou art a "Rock,

" Rock, and upon this Rock will I build my Church, " and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it." This paſſage the Ex. pretends to diſcuſs; *Zeno* denied the poſſibility of motion, and *Berkely* the exiſtence of bodies; there is no truth however diſtinct which may not be denied. The Writer would not be underſtood to ſuppoſe that the Ex. had denied that theſe words were ſpoken by Chriſt. He does not contradict the Evangeliſt. He confines the contradiction to Chriſt himſelf. Chriſt ſaid to *Peter*, *thou art a Rock*, The Ex. ſays, *Peter was not a Rock*. Decency will not permit us to preſume that Jeſus Chriſt ſpoke nonſenſe. He ſurely did not intend to ſay that *Peter* was an inanimate ſtone—he therefore ſaid that *Peter* was a Rock in the only ſenſe in which his words could be underſtood, that is, that *Peter* had that ſolidity, that unſhaken ſtability which was requiſite to ſupport that ſpiritual edifice, his Church, which the Saviour ſaid he would build on him. In this very ſenſe the Ex. denies *Peter* to be a Rock.—Would he condeſcend to aſſign ſome other ſenſe in which the epithet may be applied to *Peter?* Chriſt certainly intended to ſay ſomething. The ſenſe, ſays the Ex. is obſcure, yes to the man who don't wiſh to underſtand it: to plain men who judge by the rules of common ſenſe there is not a paſſage in ſcripture more eaſily underſtood: the Saviour ſpeaks of his Church as a ſpiritual edifice, which, like a wiſe man, he builds upon a Rock that is upon a ſolid and unſhaken foundation. St. *Paul* calls the Church the *Houſe* of God—in the ſame ſenſe, 1 *Tim.* iii. 15. the Saviour adds, that the Gates of Hell ſhall not ſubvert it. 'Tis known to every man who reads the ſcriptures, that juſtice was diſtributed at the gates of cities in them early times; that the public officers and councils were aſſembled there. Hence 'tis ſaid in *Deuteronomy*, " and thou ſee that the judges vary within thy " gates." xvii.

The Ex. muſt be ſtupid indeed, if he does not underſtand

derſtand a metaphor ſo common, that the moſt illiterate artiſt underſtands it, that is, the place for the men in power in ſuch a place; the government, for the ruling magiſtrates; the city for the men, who preſide in it; and amongſt the Jews the gates for the perſons who there preſided over their judgments and Councils. Hence the Saviour's words are as intelligible as ſounds can be, that he would found his Church in ſuch a ſolid manner, that the powers of hell ſhould not prevail againſt it; that theſe principalities and powers of whom St. *Paul* ſpeaks: "for our wreſtling is not "againſt fleſh and blood, but againſt principalities "and powers, againſt the rulers of the world, of this darkneſs, againſt the ſpirits of wickedneſs." That theſe ſhould not ſubvert it.

The reader will eaſily conceive that Chriſt here promiſes to found, not a church indiſtinctly, or in general; but *his own Church*, that is, that very Church, in excluſion to all others, to which the prophet *Iſaias* foretold that all nations would flow; that Houſe of God in which he himſelf will teach his law, that Church which *Oſee* foretold that God would eſpouſe in judgment, in juſtice and truth, and in which by his word all his children are ſpiritually begotten. If in this Church at any time groſs errors were publicly taught by the paſtors and believed by the people, the Gates of Hell would prevail, and Chriſt's promiſe would have been falſe—the prophets and apoſtles would have deceived us, and the Chriſtian religion would have been but a fiction.

To obviate that ſilly diſtinction, which the deſpair of ſupporting a defenceleſs cauſe invented, between fundamental and non-fundamental errors, the reader is prayed to obſerve that if any erroneous article of doctrine, whether primary or ſecondary, of great or of little importance in itſelf, be propoſed as revealed by God, 'tis a groſs and intolerable error: for this ſimple reaſon, that it makes God the author of a lie, which is downright

downright blaſphemy. Hence 'tis manifeſt to any man, who reaſons, who is not totally blinded by prejudice or party ſpirit, that this promiſe of Chriſt muſt exclude for ever from his Church the lighteſt ſhade of error. This is what we Catholics underſtand by infallibility.

The Saviour, inſtructing his diſciples on the ſubject of fraternal correction in the caſe of perſonal offence, directs them to ſettle the matter amicably between themſelves, or in preſence of one or two witneſſes if poſſible; but if the aggreſſor be refractory, to report the fact to the Church, and in caſe of diſobedience to the Church he orders him to be conſidered as a heathen or a publican.—*Matt.* xviii. 17. The Saviour did not enjoin impoſſibilities, nor did he ſpeak in vain: when he ordered a report to be made to the Church, he ſpoke of ſome viſible tribunal, at which ſome public officers authorized to hear complaints preſide. Does the Ex. underſtand this metaphor ſo common amongſt lawyers, that *to inform the Court* is to give a regular notice to the ſitting juſtices not to hollow to the walls; to inform the government, is to give notice to the Governor, not to every cobler in town;—to inform the Church is to give notice to the Paſtors and rulers of the Church, to the Biſhops, whom the Holy Ghoſt has conſtituted to rule the flock:—*Acts* xx. and diſobedience to their deciſion is a crime equal to idolatry, if we believe the prophet *Samuel:* "becauſe, ſaid he to "*Saul*, 'tis like the ſin of witchcraft to rebel, and like "the crime of idolatry to refuſe to obey."—1 *Sam.* xv. 23. 'Twas God's order, you'll ſay, that *Saul* diſobeyed—yes, but an order intimated by *Samuel*, and in like manner the man who diſobeys the orders of the Church, diſobeys God himſelf, if J. Chriſt tells truth: "He who hears you, ſaid the Saviour to the diſciples, "whom he authorized to preach in his name, hears me, "and he, who rejects me, rejects my father who ſent "me."—*Luke* x. 16.

Does

Does this learned Ex. pretend that diſobedience to the deciſion of the Church in meer perſonal offences is a capital crime—for that muſt be a capital crime for which the Saviour expels a man from amongſt his diſciples, and ranks him amongſt heathens, and diſobedience in matters of faith, which is a public offence againſt the Chriſtian world is in his opinion no crime at all? if ſo, the Writer ſincerely pities him: ſuch a diſpoſition argues the moſt perverſe obſtinacy, or invincible ſtupidity.

'Tis admitted by the framers of the thirty nine articles, which compoſe the code of doctrine hy law eſtabliſhed in England, that the Church has authority in controverſies of faith, but with this reſtriction, that ſhe muſt not order any thing contrary to Scripture. The reſtriction is of their own growth, and ſpeaks the exuberance of their fancy. It's not found in Scripture, and is inſulting to common ſenſe: the Saviour ſays without reſerve or reſtriction, "if he will not hear "the Church let him be to thee as a heathen."—*Matt.* xviii. Why ſo? becauſe the Redeemer had promiſed that he himſelf would be with the Paſtors and teachers in his Church, and of courſe that in it nothing contrary to the Scriptures ſhould be taught. Hence alſo ſpeaking of the lawful miniſters of the Jewiſh Church, he ſaid without reſtriction; *Matt.* xxiii. 1. "The Scribes "and Phariſees ſit on the chair of *Moſes*, all things "therefore whatſoever they bid you obſerve and do, "obſerve them." The Scribes and Phariſees were corrupt men, taught errors privately, gave falſe interpretations to the law, thro' intereſted views; with this the Saviour reproached them; but they taught no public error, nor was there any error authorized by the chair of *Moſes* in its public judgments, their falſe interpretations and ſordid views, the Saviour ſeverely and frequently condemned; this he called the leaven of the Phariſees; but their public miniſtry he authorized, becauſe that being neceſſary for the perfection of the

ſaints

ſaints was under the ſpecial protection of his providence.

Nor is the reſtriction leſs inconſiſtent with the Scriptures than with common ſenſe; for to tell a man, you muſt obey the Church if ſhe orders nothing contrary to Scripture, is to ſay, you are to be the judge in the laſt reſſort; whether you will obey or not is dependant on your fancy; 'tis to invert the eſtabliſhed order of ſociety, and make the inferior judge of the ſuperior; 'tis to efface every idea of ſubordination, and ſap the very foundation of ſociety, by telling the ſubject that he is not to obey the higher powers if he does not approve their deciſion. If St. *Paul* was directed by the ſpirit of truth, the framers of the 39 articles were moſt certainly under the influence of the ſpirit of illuſion: for his doctrine is as oppoſite to them as light is to darkneſs: "obey, ſays the Apoſtle, your guides "and be ſubject to them." *Heb.* xiii. 17. He immediately aſſigns the reaſon why he exacts this obedience without any reſtriction: "Becauſe, ſays he, they "watch over your ſouls as being obliged to accompt "for them." St. *Paul* did not order the faithful to watch over their Paſtors and inquire whether the doctrine taught by them be conſiſtent with Scripture or not. If any particular teacher ſhould introduce ſtrange doctrine, the Evangeliſt S. *John*, gives the moſt ſimple rule to detect it; a rule eaſy in practice within the comprehenſion of the moſt illiterate and abſolutely infallible: "Dearly beloved," ſays the Apoſtle, "believe not "every Spirit but try the ſpirits whether they be of "God: for many falſe Prophets are gone out into the "world." 1. *John* iv. 1. As 'twas not poſſible for the unlearned, who in all countries compoſe a great majority of the people, to try ſtrange doctrine by the rule of the Scriptures which they don't underſtand, St. *John* gives them this very ſimple rule: *Ibidem* v. 6. "We are of God, he who knoweth God heareth us:—he who is not of God heareth us not:—

"by

" by this we know the ſpirit of truth and the " ſpirit of error." 'Tis not poſſible to ſpeak more intelligibly or more to the purpoſe: we, ſays the Apoſtle, that is the Chief Paſtors of the Church, of whom St. *John* was unqueſtionably one, *are of God*, that is are God's appointment: *he who heareth us not, is not of God*, that is, that teacher, let him be who he will, or what he will, who diſobeys us the Chief Paſtors, is not of God's appointment. By this we know the ſpirit of truth and the ſpirit of error. By this obedience or diſobedience to the Chief Paſtors of the Church, true and falſe teachers are eaſily diſtinguiſhed.

Let any unprejudiced man, whether learned or unlearned try by this rule of the Apoſtle, all the pretended reformers and all the innovators who have at different times ſince the riſe of Chriſtianity, diſturbed the peace of the Church by their innovations, and he'll ſee without farther diſcuſſion that they were all falſe teachers, not one of them of God's appointment. There is not one of them who did not diſobey the Chief Paſtors of the Church then in being, and ſeparate himſelf and all his followers from that Church in which Chriſt baptiſes and teaches by his miniſters according to his promiſe.—*Matt. ult.* They are the men. Who, as St. *Jude* ſays "*ſeparate themſelves*, *v.* 19. and who did " not ſtand to the faith once delivered to the Saints." *Ibidem.*

This rule which St. *John* eſtabliſhed for detecting all innovations in doctrine has been ſtrictly enjoined by the other Apoſtles. St. *Jude* in his ſhort Epiſtle beſeeches the faithful " to contend earneſtly for the faith once delivered to the Saints *v.* 3. *v.* 17. and he adds " but you my dear brethren be mindful of the " words which have been ſpoken before by the Apoſ- " tles of our Lord J. Chriſt." So anxious was St. *Jude* to preſerve the faithful from all innovations, that he himſelf, tho' one of the twelve choſen by J. Chriſt, appeals to the authority of his fellow Apoſtles againſt new teachers.

St.

St. *Paul* in his firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*, ſays: "O "*Timothy*, keep that which is committed to thy truſt "avoiding the prophane novelties of words, and oppo- "ſitions of ſcience falſely ſo called, which ſome promi- "ſing have erred about faith," vi. 19, 20. And in his ſecond to *Timothy* he ſays: "Hold the form of ſound "words which thou haſt heard from me in faith." i. 13. And in the next chapter he ſays: "the things which "thou haſt heard of me before many witneſſes, the "ſame commend to faithful men who ſhall be fit to "teach others alſo." ii. 2. And again: continue "thou in thoſe things which thou haſt learned, and "which have been committed to thee, knowing of "whom thou haſt learned them. iii. 14. The ſame injunctions this Apoſtle gave to the faithful in general: "Therefore brethren," ſaid he, "ſtand faſt and hold "the traditions, which you have learned whether by "word or by our letter." *Theſſ.* ii. 14.

At the ſame time that the Apoſtles ſo pointedly directed the faithful to adhere invariably *to the faith once delivered to the Saints*, they warned them againſt the inſidious artifices of innovators and pretended reformers. Thus in his firſt of *Timothy*, iv. 1: "Now the "Spirit manifeſtly ſaith that in the laſt times ſome "ſhall depart from the faith, giving heed to ſpirits of "error and doctrines of devils, ſpeaking lies in hypo- "criſy and having their conſciences ſeared." And in his ſecond to this diſciple the Apoſtle ſays, iii. 1. "know this alſo that in the laſt days ſhall come on "dangerous times: for men ſhall be lovers of them- "ſelves, covetous, haughty, proud, blaſphemers, "having an appearance of godlineſs but deſtroy- "ing the power thereof, now theſe avoid, for of this "ſort are they . . . . . who reſiſt the truth, men cor- "rupt in mind, reprobate concerning the faith." In his epiſtle to the Romans the Apoſtle ſays: "I beſeech "you my brethren to mark them who cauſe diſſen-

tions and offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learned. *Rom.* xvi. 17.

The Apoſtles did not confine themſelves ſimply to warn the faithful againſt new teachers, they denounced the moſt dreadful curſes againſt any man, who would preſume to introduce any innovation or even the leaſt deviation from the doctrine which they taught; they allowed no arbitrary conſtructions on the law according *to fancy or caprice*, our Ex'rs ſtandard: "If," ſaid St. *Paul* to the Galatians, "an Angel from Hea-"ven preach a goſpel to you beſides that which we "have preached to you, let him be accurſed. As we "ſaid before ſo I ſay now again, if any one preach a "Goſpel to you beſides that which you have received, "let him be accurſed." *Gal.* i. 6, 7.

This unerring rule delivered by the Apoſtles has been invariably obſerved by the Catholic Church in all ages, and will till the end of time, from whence it manifeſtly appears that even the poſſibility of error is excluded from her deciſions.

We know that J. Chriſt taught his Apoſtles verbally all the truths of religion, "but I have called you "friends, becauſe all things whatſoever which I have "heard of my father I have made known to you." *John* xv. 15. Theſe truths the Apoſtles taught the Chriſtians of the firſt age in their public lectures, and in their private diſcourſes with their immediate diſciples they explained all difficulties, and fixed the ſenſe of ambiguous paſſages thereby removing all uncertainty. The rule of adhering *to the faith once delivered to the Saints*, and the curſe denounced againſt all innovations in it, or deviations from it, obliged the Chriſtians of the next age to adhere invariably to the doctrine taught in the firſt age, to reject with horror every innovation, and ſtigmatize every pretended reformer. Hence we Catholics diſtinctly mark every error, which has been obtruded on the unwary by artful and deſigning men, from the

days

days of *Nicolas* the apoſtate deacon, down to *Weſtley* of ranting memory; we aſſign the times, the places, the authors, the then paſtors of the Church from whom they ſeparated themſelves, and who verifying the prophecy of *Iſaias* condemned them: "every tongue which riſes in judgment againſt thee, thou ſhalt condemn."

The next text is taken from St. *Paul's* firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*:—"theſe things I write to you hoping "ſhortly to come to you, but if I delay, that you may "know how to conduct yourſelf in the houſe of "God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth."—"*Stulos kai édraióuma* "*tes aletheias.*" The Apoſtle calls the Church the *Houſe of God.* The Ex. will admit that the Church is under the immediate protection of J. Chriſt, as a houſe is under the immediate and ſpecial protection of its owner: that J. Chriſt dwells in his Church as the maſter does in his houſe; if ſo, he muſt admit that its enemies will never prevail againſt it, or diſpute the power of J. Chriſt: for to prevail againſt a houſe under the ſpecial protection of any power, is to prevail not againſt the houſe, but againſt the protecting power. Thus error leads to blaſphemy.

This is that Houſe of God, to which, if we believe the prophet *Iſaias*, all nations will flow, "*nahorou cal* "*goiim*," and in which he himſelf will teach us his ways, "*ve jorenou midarcheio.*" The Apoſtle adds that the Church is the *Pillar and ground of truth.* 'Tis the pillar which ſupports the edifice, and on its ground it reſts. The truth therefore of religion, for that is the truth of which the Apoſtle ſpeaks, reſts on the teſtimony of the Church, and on that ground we may reſt our faith with ſecurity, not on the wild conjectures of modern ſpeculatiſts, who ſubſtite *fancy* and *caprice* to truth.

However ſtrong this metaphor of the Apoſtle, 'tis ſtrictly juſt: for thoſe truths which we know, but from the teſtimony of the Church, muſt of all neceſſity

reſt on the credit of its teſtimony; the truths of religion are not to be known by us, to whom God has not ſpoken immediately, but by the teſtimony of the Church, not the teſtimony of the primitive Paſtors, they are long ſince dead, not one of them have we ſeen or can we ſee; but by the teſtimony of the Paſtors this day in being:—they are the men, who atteſt that the truths of religion, which they now teach were taught by their immediate predeceſſors. This reaſoning is applicable to every age of the Church, and will continue in the ſame force till the end of time: 'tis a mockery to pretend that we may know the truths of religion from the Scriptures independently of this teſtimony of the Church: becauſe 'tis from this teſtimony we know the Scriptures themſelves. The Apoſtle therefore juſtly ſtyles the Church the pillar and ground of truth, an unſhaken pillar which ſupports the truth, a ſolid ground on which we reſt our faith, "*Stulos kai* "*edraioma tes Aletheias.*"

From this paſſage we learn alſo that all the Apoſtles' previous inſtructions to his diſciple were verbal: he ſent this written inſtruction in caſe of long abſence.

If the Ex. will admit that his tongue was as infallible as his pen, he muſt alſo admit that his verbal inſtructions were as authentic as theſe contained in his epiſtle. And as we know from *Euſebius*, *Lib. 3. C. 4.* that *Timothy* was then a Biſhop,—and from *Chryſoſtom*, *Hom* 15. in 1 *Tim.* that he was charged with the inſpection of all the Churches in Aſia,—in theſe verbal inſtructions he muſt have been taught the whole economy of Church diſcipline, the manner of adminiſtering the ſacraments, their number, their effects, the neceſſary diſpoſitions to receive the ſacraments worthily, in a word the whole of Chriſtianity reduced to practice. Theſe truths thus verbally delivered by the Apoſtles to their diſciples, whom they conſtituted paſtors and teachers over their reſpective portions of Chriſt's flock, and tranſmitted by them to their ſucceſſors, is, what we Catholics,

Catholics, call tradition; what the pretended reformers retrenched, and at one ſtroke annihilated religion.

The Writer wiſhes to know from the Ex. or his moſt powerful ally, whether this Church which St. *Paul* calls the pillar and ground of truth, does at preſent, or has at any time ſupported error? if ſo ſhe was no longer the pillar of truth, but the pillar of falſehood; the Apoſtle was deceived, and has deceived us; if not that infallibility of deciſion ſo painful to the Ex. is infallibly true:—in truth there is no mixture of error: the leaſt poſſible error makes a propoſition, whatever truth it may include, ſimply and abſolutely falſe. Hence this maxim amongſt philoſophers "*Bonum ex* "*integrâ Cauſâ malum exminimo defectu.*"

To this the Writer adds a ſecond queſtion equally embarraſſing: is that Church which publicly profeſſes herſelf fallible, ſubject to error, which ſays, ſhe may deceive or be deceived, is ſhe the pillar and ground of truth? if ſo, ſhe's infallibly erroneous. This involves a manifeſt contradiction—if not, ſhe's not the Church of the living God: for St. *Paul* poſitively aſſerts, "that "the Church of the living God is the pillar and ground of truth." The Ex. would do well to examine this laſt argument with accuracy: there is no room for fundamental or non-fundamental diſtinctions. An able ſophiſt may extract from a fertile imagination ſome ſpecious reaſon to miſlead the uninformed; but after all efforts the difficulty will remain entire.

To ſubſtitute invective to argument is a thread-bare artifice; to divert the attention of a deluded populace from the real ſtate of the controverſy by declaiming againſt the ſcandalous lives of Popes or others, is a meer mockery, which ruins the reputation of a writer amongſt intelligent men; it ſhews that he is reduced to ſupport a defenceleſs cauſe by indefenſible means: for whether theſe Popes were ſcandalous in their lives or not is foreign to the queſtion in debate: we know that *David* was guilty of adultery and murder; that

Solomon

Solomon was guilty of the moſt ſcandalous exceſſes, even idolatry: 1 *Th.* xi. 7.—" *He went after Aſtoreth* " *the Goddeſs of the Sidonians, and after Melchom the* " *abomination of the Ammonites.*"—Were their propheſies leſs true? we know that *Caiphas* was a very bad man, yet the ſentence which he pronounced againſt J. Chriſt, though it expoſed the moſt rancorous malice and corruption of heart, was, notwithſtanding, under the direction of providence, ſo that the evangeliſt ſays, " *He did not ſay this of himſelf, but being High-Prieſt* " *of the year he propheſied that J. Chriſt was to die for* " *the nation.*"—*John* xi. 51.—So true it is that the authority of public men does not depend on their perſonal qualities, their virtues or their vices. It muſt be admitted that the ſcandalous lives of men high in office have been at all times a rock of ſcandal to weak and uninformed Chriſtians—of this the Apoſtle was well aware, and in conſequence he diligently inſtructs his diſciple in his paſtoral duty, aſſigning a motive capable of making a ſtrong impreſſion on *Timothy's* mind: he tells him that the Church, in which he was placed as a guide to others, is the Houſe *of God, the Pillar and ground of truth*, that his conduct muſt be ſuch as would not give offence to others: " giving offence to " nobody."—2 *Cor. v.* 16. or induce them to ſuſpect that the Church, which God had choſen as the inſtrument to extend the faith to the extremities of the earth, was not an unſhaken pillar, a ground upon which they might reſt their faith with confidence and ſafety.

Let us now take a view of that authentic promiſe with which the Saviour cloſed his Goſpel according to St. *Matthew*. The paſſage is remarkable; in it there is no metaphor; language does not afford terms more ſimple, more conciſe, or more intelligible. " *And the* " *eleven diſciples went into Galilee unto the mountain,* " *where Jeſus had ordered them, and ſeeing him,* " *they adored him, ſome doubted, and Jeſus coming* " *ſpoke to them, ſaying: all power is given to me in hea-*

" *ven*

" *ven and on earth; go ye therefore and teach all na-*
" *tions, baptiſing them in the name of the father, and of*
" *the ſon, and of the holy ghoſt, teaching them to obſerve*
" *all things whatſoever, which I have commanded you,*
" *and behold I am with you all days till the conſumma-*
" *tion of the age. Amen.*"—*Matt. ult.*

Hence we ſee the Saviour aſſemble, not all his diſciples indiſcriminately, but the eleven whom he had ſelected for that purpoſe, and conſtituted his ambaſſadors to the world; he orders them to go and teach all nations: in the original text to make all nations diſciples, " *matheteuſate panta ta ethna.*" An arduous undertaking indeed! a work infinitely ſurpaſſing the power of man; but the Redeemer had prefaced his order, ſaying, " *All power is given to me in heaven and on*
" *earth.* And accompanied it with this aſſurance, *behold I am with you*; and to remove every ſhadow of doubt from their minds, he did not ſay, I am with you, at certain times, or in certain places, or upon certain occaſions, no! but ſaid he, " *I am with you all days*
" *till the conſummation.*" He promiſes a permanent preſence without interruption—to what end? to make all nations his diſciples. As this great work was not to be effected in a day or a year, or within any limited time, the Redeemer aſſigns no other limit but the conſummation of time. All efforts to elude the force of this promiſe are vain: in expreſs terms the Saviour inſtitutes a ſociety perpetually viſible while time continues to run; a ſociety conſiſting of miniſters who teach and baptize, and of the faithful who are taught and baptized; ſpeaking to theſe miniſters he tells them that he himſelf will be with them teaching and baptizing till the end of time; that this ſociety is Catholic, that is, univerſal both in time and place, he diſtinctly declares: *teach all nations, till the end of time.* He gives his peace to the Jews who were heirs of the promiſe, " *to him who is near,*"—*Iſaias* lvii. 19. *beginning from Jeruſalem.*—*Matt.* xxiv. 47.

to

to Samaria, and in due courſe of time to the extremities of the earth: "*You will be witneſſes to me in Jeru-*
"*ſalem and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the extre-*
"*mity of the earth.*" "to him who is far off," ſaid the prophet *Iſaias*, lvii.

St. *Paul* ſays, writing to the *Epheſians*, "*coming*
"*he preached peace to you who were far off, and to thoſe*
"*who were near*".—*Eph.* ii. 17. 'Twas the ſame Saviour, if we believe St. *Paul*, who preached peace to the Gentiles, who were far off in the perſon of his miniſters, who in his own perſon preached to the Jews, who were near.

This doctrine the Apoſtle every where inculcates: thus he ſays, *Acts* xxvi. 22. "*that he taught nothing*
"*but what the Prophets had foretold that Chriſt would*
"*ſuffer, and that he firſt from the reſurrection of the*
"*dead would announce light to the people*, (the Jews)
"*and to the nations*, (the heathens.") We know that Chriſt in his own perſon did not preach to the Gentiles; 'twas therefore in the perſon of his miniſters that he preached peace to them, and will continue to preach according to his promiſe until the conſummation.

To inſure the ſucceſs of this aſtoniſhing undertaking, that is, the converſion of all nations, their incorporation into that one ſociety, which he then formed, and uninterrupted continuation till the end of time:—the Saviour ſays, "*Behold, I am with you all days till the con-*
"*ſummation of the age, I, to whom all power is given in*
"*heaven and on earth, am with you.*" He gives his Almighty Power as an additional ſecurity to his divine veracity, that his promiſe would be fulfilled; that by their miniſtry he would incorporate in their ſociety all the nations of the earth. Hence St. *Luke* ſays, *Acts* ii. 47. "*The Lord added theſe who were to be ſaved*
"*daily to the church.*"—*ô karios proſetithei tous ſozo-*
"*menvas kath émerun té ekkleſia.*" Hence that article in the baptiſmal creed: "*I believe the Catholic Church*
"*holy; the Communion of Saints.*" That is, I believe that

that in the Catholic Church there is nothing taught but what is pure and holy; that in it all the Saints are united. This ſociety therefore muſt ſubſiſt invariably the ſame while there will be any of God's elect on earth; and that miniſtry by which the Lord added daily to his Church thoſe, who were to be ſaved, muſt continue the ſame to the end of time; that God may add in the ſame manner, and by the ſame means, all his elect to his Church, that they may be in the communion of the Saints. Thus is verified that promiſe: *I am with you all days till the conſummation.*

The Saviour did not promiſe to exclude vice and immorality, on the contrary, he foretold that the tares would grow up in his field with the good grain till the harveſt; the good grain, if we believe his own explanation of the parable, are the children of his kingdom, the tares the children of the wicked one, they will be undiſtinguiſhed in his field till the end of time. Here we have his expreſs declaration that the children of his kingdom will be without intermiſſion mixed with the children of the wicked one till the end of time. Theſe his children muſt be in his Church, in the communion of his Saints. St. *Luke* ſays in formal terms, "*that* "*the Lord added daily to his Church thoſe who were to* "*be ſaved.*" This truth, which the Ex. will not venture to deny preſuppoſed, an inſoluble argument againſt the pretended reformation is thus propoſed: the day before *Luther* commenced the reformation the good grain was in the field; the elect of God were in his Church, and he himſelf, according to his promiſe, teaching and baptizing by the miniſtry of theſe paſtors and teachers, whom he gave for the perfecting of the Saints; *Eph.* iv.—'Tis therefore undeniably true that *Luther* did ſeparate himſelf from that Church, in which J. Chriſt was teaching and baptizing, and conſequently from J. Chriſt himſelf; that he was one of theſe unhappy men of whom St. *Jude* ſays: "*they ſe-* "*parate themſelves.*" Againſt this ſimple truth all

 ſuppoſition

ſuppoſition is vain. When then the Ex. ſays that infallibility of deciſion in matters of faith is a miracle, he confounds ideas, and miſleads the incautious and the unlearned: 'tis in the Church of Chriſt that his elect are perfected, 'tis not by error but by truth; not by wavering opinion but by faith; there is therefore nothing taught in the Church of Chriſt but truth, no faith *but that which what once delivered to the Saints.* St. *Jude.* Whilſt the Ex. in order to divert the attention of his readers, and introduce confuſion in their ideas, declaims againſt miracles as if there was any thing miraculous in the courſe of God, providence, and the accompliſhment of Chriſt's promiſe, he himſelf to this pretended miracle ſubſtitutes a manifeſt abſurdity, that is, that the elect of Chriſt, who have been in the world for at leaſt 800 years before this boaſted reformation, have been perfected not by the ordinary means inſtituted by Chriſt, that is by faith and the miniſtry of theſe paſtors, whom he had given expreſſly for the perfecting of the Saints, but by ſome extraordinary means, of which we have no idea. That there were elect in the world, and will till the conſummation of time, we are told by Chriſt himſelf; that they have been perfected by the ordinary means inſtituted by Chriſt, or by ſome extraordinary means is evidently true. If the Ex. admits that the ordinary means of perfecting the Saints were in the Church before *Luther's* ſeparation; the reformation is indefenſible; if he denies it, he muſt introduce ſome extraordinary means inconſiſtent with the order of providence, the promiſes of Chriſt, and the firſt elements of common ſenſe—thus every attempt to ſupport error leads to abſurdity.

Let us hear St. *Auſtin's* reaſoning on this ſubject. The Writer does not pretend to found an argument on the authority of St. *Auſtin*, or of any of the fathers: the Ex. would reject themſelves as parties: they were all arrant Papiſts, their teſtimony in favour of Popery would be inadmiſſible:—as the teſtimony of the Jewiſh

ish ministers was inadmissible in favour of that worship whilst it continued. The Writer has to lament that in them early ages of the Church he can produce no Protestant witness. The Ex. will not ascribe it to neglect or inattention, if he will but recollect that they were not yet known to the learned world. There were no *Tillotsons*, no *Jortins*, not even a *S.* or a *mock Palæologus*.

The *Manichæans* pretended that their founder, *Manes*, was an Apostle—'tis true his title was as good as that of the German Apostle. The Epistle of *Manes* begins thus:—"*Manes*, the Apostle of J. Christ, by "the providence of God the Father." A man would be tempted to imagine that *Luther* had this epistle before him when he stiled, or rather dubbed himself. Evangelist at Wertemberg. To this *Austin* replies in his book against the Epistle, *chap.* iv. "I ask therefore "who is this *Manes?* you will answer the Apostle of "J. Christ. I do not believe it. Perhaps you will read "the Gospel to me thence endeavouring to prove it. "What if you had to reason with one, who does not "believe the Gospel? what would you do if such an "one should say unto you, I do not believe you? this reasoning of St. *Austin*, whatever contempt the Ex. or his friend *Jortin*, may have for his authority, is absolutely unanswerable and applies with the same force to any other innovator as to *Manes*. For how will this pretended reformer shew an infidel that he ought to believe the Gospel? he must of all necessity have recourse to the testimony of the Church, in whose hands he finds it, and if he denies the infallibility of her testimony, he leaves no infallible authority; on which, to rest his belief in the Gospel. Hence St. *Austin* says, in the course of his reasoning, "I would not believe the "Gospel if the authority of the Church did move me "thereto. Why should I not obey them, (the Bish-"ops) saying to me: do not believe *Manes*, whom I "obeyed, saying, believe the Gospel."—Change the

name, and this argument has an irreſiſtible force againſt any pretended reformer. It is a general theorem applicable to all ſimilar caſes. St. *Auſtin* proceeds to preſs the *Manicheans:* "Chooſe, ſays he, if you ſay: "believe the Catholics; they admoniſh me to give no "credit to you, wherefore believing them I cannot "but diſbelieve you; but if you ſay, do not believe the "Catholics, then you do not take the proper method to "oblige me by the Goſpel to believe *Manes*: becauſe "I believe the Goſpel itſelf on the teſtimony of Catho-"lics; but if you ſay: you have rightly believed the "Catholics praiſing the Goſpel, but you are not to be-"lieve them if they cenſure *Manes*. Do you think me "ſo ſtupid, that, whilſt no reaſon is aſſigned, I ſhall "believe what you pleaſe; and diſbelieve what you "pleaſe? you muſt not only bid me believe, but ma-"nifeſtly and evidently ſhew me the truth, make me "know it; if you aſſign ſuch a reaſon (that is, why I "ſhould not believe the Catholics,) diſmiſs the Goſpel; "if you hold the Goſpel I will hold myſelf to thoſe "from whoſe preaching I have believed the Goſpel, "at their command I will not believe you . . . . .—If "in the Goſpel you find any place that is manifeſt to "prove that *Manes* is a true Apoſtle, then you will "weaken the authority of the Catholics, who order "me not to believe you; this authority thus weakened "I cannot believe the Goſpel. Wherefore, if in the "Goſpel no manifeſt place be found concerning the "Apoſtleſhip of *Manes*, I will rather believe the Ca-"tholics than you; but if you can read me any place "out of the Goſpel for *Manes*, I will neither believe "them nor you. I will not believe them becauſe "they have deceived me concerning you, nor will I "believe you becauſe you cite them, who have deceived "me."

In this irreſiſtible manner St. *Auſtin* profeſſedly demonſtrates againſt the *Manicheans*, that all revealed truths reſt ultimately on the teſtimony of the Catholic Church,

Church, and hence he concludes that if that teſtimony be not infallible, there is nothing certain in religion, nothing which a wiſe man can prudently believe.

Tertullian's reaſoning on the ſame ſubject is equally ſtrong; the Ex. will find ſome difficulty in eluding it. "All ſects," ſays he, "are known by the date of their "commencement. *Marcion* and *Valentinus* came in "the time *Antoninus*, their diſciples were not before "themſelves, they compoſe no part of the family of "J. Chriſt; his children deſcend without interruption "from himſelf; the *Marcionites* have Churches, but "falſe and degenerate as waſps have hives." A man is not admiſſible to ſay that he reforms the doctrine of the Church: the doctrine taught by J. Chriſt was not formed by man, nor does he want the aſſiſtance of man to reform it; he did not expect the aſſiſtance of a *Marcion* or a *Valentinus*, or of any other innovator to rebuild the edifice, which he himſelf had built upon a rock, declaring that the powers of hell ſhould not ſubvert it. "He did not ſend the Holy Ghoſt in vain to "teach all truth: 'tis impoſſible that the Holy Ghoſt "would permit all the Churches in the world to err. "Shew us then ſome Church in the world, which held "this new doctrine which you introduce or acknow-"ledge that you invented it. You pretend that you "find it in the Scriptures. Don't you know that "the Scriptures themſelves are in the hands of theſe "Churches, whoſe errors you pretend to rectify?" that the Goſpels and Epiſtles have not formed theſe Churches but were written for them and addreſſed to them; that 'tis on their teſtimony they have been received:—"*ejus aſſiſtente teſtimonio.*"—*Ad. Mar. L.* 4. 23. "To "whom do the Scriptures belong? is it not to theſe "Churches to which they were addreſſed, and who re-"ceived with the Scriptures the true and genuine ſenſe of them." The ſenſe intended by the inſpired Writers, whom they might conſult upon every difficult or ambiguous paſſage? *cujus ſunt Scripturæ?*—*ibidem* 20.

Hence

Hence 'tis manifeſt that where the ſource of our faith is, there alſo is the truth of the Scriptures. "The "true interpretation and all Chriſtian traditions."—From this principle *Tertullian* concludes, that without any diſcuſſion on the Scriptures we confound all ſectaries by ſhewing them that the Scriptures don't belong to them; that they cannot have recourſe to them "we "refute *Praxeas* as we did *Marcion* and *Valentinus*," "you are a new man *novellus* you come too late *poſterus*, "you are but of yeſterday *heſternus*. The day before "you were not known to the world, you are therefore "no part of the family of J. Chriſt, who was yeſterday "and this day, and who is of all ages."—*Heb.* xiii. 8.

'Tis common with all innovators and pretended reformers to reject the authority of theſe ſublime writers whom we Catholics call fathers of the Church; but hitherto the Writer has ſeen no attempt made to invalidate the force of their reaſoning. In the commencement of the reformation, whilſt there was yet ſome reſpect for antiquity, theſe keepers of Catholic records were taught to ſpeak good Proteſtant Engliſh; in different parts of their works, in which 'twas not poſſible to make them ſpeak a language, which they never knew, efforts were made to diſtort their words from the intended ſignification. This artifice was immediately detected by Catholic Writers, and only ſerved to ruin the reputation of the reformers; late controverſiſts found it more convenient to give up the works of the fathers to the right owners and confine themſelves ſolely to the Scriptures. This is certainly the more judicious plan, but not the more ſafe or tenable: for that aſſent of the mind to revealed truths which is called faith by all denominations of Chriſtians, muſt be infallible. This poſition is evident; it muſt therefore be founded on an infallible motive: for the aſſent to truth cannot be more infallible than the motive which produces it. The man who rejects the infallible authority of the Catholic Church has no infallible motive to believe

lieve the Scriptures true ; his assent therefore to revealed truths is not infallible, 'tis not faith but a meer human opinion. In vain we are told that man is a fallible creature—no man denies nor even doubts it ; but however fallible the man may be, his assent to truth is absolutely infallible, if the motive be so. Thus for example, because 'tis evident that two and two make four, the most illiterate man's assent to that truth is infallible, because evidence is an infallible motive. In like manner the assent of an American to this truth—*London is a city in England*, is infallible, because 'tis not possible in the present order of things, that an universal testimony should deceive us;—by the same rule the assent of the most illiterate Catholic to his truth of religion. "The Scriptures are divinely inspired," is infallible—*infallible* because he founds it on the testimony of the Catholic Church, a testimony more universal; more authentic and more forcible than that which attests the existence of London; the assent of the most learned Protestant to the truth of Scripture is fallible and fallacious—why so? because as he rejects the authority of that Church, in whose hands the reformers found the Scriptures, he must found his assent on his own opinion, or the conjecture of some of these pretended reformers, which is evidently and confessedly fallible, and fallacious.

Thus we see, that error considered in every point of view, is untenable ; that no artifice, no subterfuge, no power of sophistry can support it against the piercing light of truth, which, stript of every adventitious ornament, is in its native colours irresistible.

The Writer presumes that he has already satisfied the Ex. or any other unprejudiced man, that this infallibility of decision in doctrinal truths, and exemption from error was foretold in the Old Testament, promised in the New, asserted by the Apostles in the first Council of Jerusalem, and claimed by every Council down to the present day; but what is yet of greater

importance

importance, that on this very infallibility of the church, ultimately reſts our aſſent to all revealed truths of religion; that 'tis the only motive which can render this aſſent infallible—which aſſent being perfected by divine grace and elevated to a ſupernatural order, is called divine faith, that faith without which, if we believe St. *Paul*, 'tis impoſſible to pleaſe God. He now returns to the Ex'rs. objections againſt St. *Peter's* ſupremacy. They are ſtated in a confuſed manner, whether to embarraſs the ſubject, or from ſome confuſion in the Ex'rs. ideas, is not neceſſary to enquire. In the promiſes made to *Peter*. *Matt.* xvi. and *John* xxi. The Ex. acutely remarks "that *Peter* was not a Rock."—No, he was conſtituted by J. Chriſt, the foundation of that ſpiritual edifice, *the Houſe of God*, which St. *Paul* calls *the Houſe of the living God*. The houſe did not fall, becauſe the owner protects it; nor was the foundation removed from it. There it reſts, and will ſecurely reſt till the end of time, becauſe the God of truth has ſaid it.

"It is not to be ſuppoſed," ſays our Ex. *p.* 61, "that there are material gates to hell, or actual locks "to heaven; and that Chriſt delivered to *Peter* the "corporeal keys of them, or that the binding and "looſing ſpoken of was by ropes and chains, ſo re-"ſpecting the feeding the lambs and ſheep 'twas not "the animals of that name, which are to be under-"ſtood." This paſſage is quoted entire as a ſpecimen of the ſublime. The orator will learn to apply epithets: actual locks, corporeal keys! and the philoſopher will find that though hell be the receptacle of bodies as well as ſpirits, 'tis not a material place. The reader muſt admire the depth of our Ex'rs. penetration he has diſcovered that *Peter* was not a ſtone; that the Saviour did not ſpeak of theſe bleating animals which we call ſheep. He has made a ſecond diſcovery not leſs wonderful, "that in theſe texts there is no "pre-eminence, no power given to *Peter* over the "other

" other Apoſtles." Hitherto the world was in the habit of conſidering the Apoſtles as compoſing a part of the flock of J. Chriſt; at that time they compoſed a notable part of his then little flock. On what principle does the Ex. pretend to exclude them? if an order expreſſly given by J. Chriſt to rule and feed them as the Greek terms " *poimanei* and *boskei*," ſignify, imply no authority, no pre-eminence, we are yet to learn what theſe terms mean. The Ex. has recourſe to his old rule of faith, *conjecture:* " We are left," ſays he, " to diſcover their figurative meaning by con-" ſidering the ſubject matter by inference, by conſulting " our own common ſenſe, and by comparing them with " other paſſages more plain and direct." It has been juſtly remarked that there is no man ſo blind as the man who will not ſee; here the Ex. has recourſe to every expedient which imagination can ſuggeſt to introduce obſcurity in paſſages which are as intelligible as language can make them: the Saviour ſays to *Peter*, *Matt.* xvi.—*I will give thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.* We are not left to conjecture what is underſtood by theſe keys: 'tis a metaphor which is not to be miſunderſtood: the keys of all cities in all civilized countries, are given to the chief rulers to ſignify the authority and juriſdiction which they exerciſe over the citizens. The genuine ſenſe and intended ſignification of this metaphor we have clearly explained, in the Scripture itſelf: the Lord ſaid by his prophet *Iſaias* to *Sobna: Iſa.* xxii. 29.—" I will expel you from your " ſtation, and depoſe you from your miniſtry. On that " I will call my ſervant *Eliakim* ſon of *Helkias*, I will " clothe him with your coat, and ſtrengthen him with " your belt, and your authority I will give in his hand, " and he will be as a father to the inhabitants of Jeru-" ſalem and to the houſe of Juda, and I will give the " key of the houſe of *David* on his ſhoulder; he will " open and none will ſhut, he will ſhut and none will " open." By the key of the houſe of *David* is here

manifeſtly ſignified the ſupreme authority in the temple given to *Eliakim*. The temple was called the houſe of *David*, becauſe 'twas built at his expence, and by his direction, and according to the inſtructions which he gave to his ſon *Solomon*.

In the Revelation we read: "*Thus ſaith the holy* "*one, the true one, who hath the key of David, who* "*opens and no one ſhuts, who ſhuts and no one opens.*" *Rev.* iii. 7. Will the Ex. admit that in this paſſage the key ſignifies the ſupreme power and ſovereign authority of J. Chriſt himſelf? figurative expreſſions, ſays he, are to be explained by other texts more plain and direct. If there had been a ſhadow of ambiguity in the Saviour's words, why not explain them by theſe texts in which the metaphor can't be miſunderſtood? this the Ex. carefully avoids, and without offering or even attempting a wild conjecture at the meaning of Chriſt's words, he confidently aſſerts that Chriſt did not intend to beſtow any pre-eminence on *Peter*, but Chriſt intended ſomething. Does the Ex. pretend that his words are empty ſounds? that they convey no idea at all? or that he ſaid one thing and intended another? that, though Chriſt expreſſly declared he would make *Peter* the foundation of that ſpiritual edifice his Church, and give him the ſupreme authority in his ſpiritual kingdom, he did not intend it, but ſomething elſe, which we don't know? this is not reaſoning, but inſulting reaſon; not an attempt to ſolve a difficulty, but a ſubterfuge to elude an argument, the force of which is irreſiſtible.

The promiſe which Chriſt made, the xvith. of *Matthew*, he fulfilled the xxiſt. of *John*, ſaying to *Peter*, in preſence of the other Apoſtles: "Feed my lambs. "Rule my ſheep. Feed my ſheep." The Ex. does not think it neceſſary to enquire what the Saviour intended. Nor does the Writer. The Ex. thinks or pretends to think, 'tis clear that he did not intend "to "give *Peter* any pre-eminence or authority over the "other

" other Apoſtles." The Writer thinks, and ſo muſt every man who knows the force of language, that he did intend it, or that he ſpoke nonſenſe, which is blaſphemy to aſſert or think: for his words convey no other idea: to feed his ſheep and his lambs can ſignify nothing elſe but to feed the whole of his flock, which is compoſed of ſheep and lambs; the other Apoſtles then and there preſent, were the very men who were in a particular manner entruſted to *Peter's* care: of them the Saviour had ſaid before his death, ſpeaking to *Peter*: *Luke* xxii. 31. " *Simon, Simon*, " behold Satan has explored you that he might ſift you " like wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith " may not ceaſe, and when thou ſhalt be converted, " confirm thy brethren." Were not the other Apoſtles theſe brethren whom *Peter* was ordered to confirm in the faith after his converſion?

We are not left to conjecture what is meant by the flock of J. Chriſt: he himſelf tells us they are his diſciples for whom he died: *John* x. " I am the good " ſhepherd; the good ſhepherd lays down his life for " his ſheep." This metaphor is ſo common in the Scriptures, that even ignorance can't miſtake it. And if this Ex. an Oxford ſcholar, does not underſtand it, we may apply to him what *Toinette* ſays in *Moliere's* comedy: " *vivent les colleges dou l'òn ſort ſi habile hom-* " *me.*"

The Ex. thinks he has yet a ſubterfuge: though within the range of imagination he can find nothing which Chriſt did intend, if he did not intend to conſtitute *Peter* Chief Paſtor of his flock: " It," he ſays, " ſeems contrary to the ſpirit which he was deſirous of " inſtilling to veſt a pre-eminence any where." *p.* 63. What! that which he has ſaid and done contrary to the ſpirit which he was deſirous of eſtabliſhing amongſt his diſciples! is the ſpirit of ſubordination, of unity and unanimity, which he and his Apoſtles have ſo ſtrictly and frequently enjoined, contrary to the ſpirit

which he was desirous of instilling? contrary to the language and conduct of Christ to vest such *a pre-eminence any where:* Christ therefore in the Ex'rs. opinion has, in the true jacobinical style, established downright anarchy in his Church; a sort of equality which never was known in the most democratical society: for without some bond of union no society can be formed. St. *Paul* thought that Christ had given some pastors and teachers to his Church; *Eph.* iv.—and in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, he gives a description of the Church as directly opposite to this Ex'rs. ideas as light is to darkness: "as the body is one," says the Apostle, "and has many members, all the members "of one body, though many, are but one body, and so "Christ: for in one spirit we have all been baptized "into one body . . . . . If the foot should say, because "I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it there-"fore not of the body? and if the ear should say: be-"cause I am not the eye I am not of the body; is it "therefore not of the body? if the whole body were "the eye, where is the hearing? and if the whole "body were the hearing, where is the smelling? now "God has placed the members, each of them in the "body as it hath pleased him. If all were one mem-"ber, where the body? now there are many members "and one body—the eye cannot say to the hand, I "don't want you—nor again can the head say to the "feet, I don't want you . . . . . you are the body of "Christ, and members each a partial—*melé ek me-*"*rous.*"—1 *Cor.* xii. The Apostle describes the Church as a compact body, animated by one and the same spirit, having of course the most perfect unity and unanimity; in which there is the most exact subordination in regular gradation from the head down to the feet. The Apostle never dream't of that perfect equality and independance, which our Ex. thinks Christ had established "*vesting no pre-eminence any where.*" Does he imagine that the head has no pre-eminence in the

the human body? the Ex. may reply that Chriſt is our head. True—he is head of the whole city of Jeruſalem. "Which he (God the Father) wrought in "Chriſt, raiſing him from the dead, and ſetting him "at his own right hand, in the heavenly places above "all principality and power, and virtue and dominion, "and every name, that is named not only in this age, "but that which is to come; and he hath put all "things under his feet and hath given him head over "all things to his Church." *Eph.* i. 22. and in his Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians:* "who is head of every "principality and power." *Col.* ii. 10. The Apoſtle aſſerts that Chriſt as man is head over all the inhabitants of the Heavens as well as over his Church on earth; but to the Corinthians the Apoſtle ſpeaks of Chriſt's Church on earth; in which, he ſays, there is a head which cannot ſay to the feet, I don't want you. 'Tis preſumed the Apoſtle did not not think J. Chriſt was that head, which could not ſay to the feet. I don't want you: the Apoſtle was not accuſtomed to blaſpheme. This head therefore, of which he ſpeaks to the Corinthians, is a viſible part of that viſible Church on earth, which he accurately deſcribes diſtinguiſhing the different members which compoſe it, and ſhewing their mutual dependence. The Apoſtle well knew that J. Chriſt was the ſupreme head of the Church without any ſubordination to, or dependance on any other; but he alſo knew that this Supreme Head being inviſible to his Church here on earth, had conſtituted a viſible head ſubordinate and immediately ſubject to himſelf; that his Church might not appear monſtrous, that is, a viſible body without a viſible head. The Apoſtle alſo knew that 'twas not more inconſiſtent with order that J. Chriſt the primary head, ſhould conſtitute a ſubordinate head, than that, he the primary foundation, ſhould eſtabliſh a ſecondary and ſubordinate foundation; hence he ſays to the *Epheſians:* "that they are built on the foundation of the

" the Apoſtles and Prophets, J. Chriſt himſelf being " the corner ſtone." *Eph.* ii. 20. This and ſimilar texts the Ex. ſays, *p.* 64, are very intelligible, " for " ſince 'twas the Apoſtles, who taught the world the " Chriſtian religion, Chriſtianity might be ſaid to be " built upon them as upon a rock or foundation." If this be ſo intelligible of the Apoſtles in general, why exclude St. *Peter*, whoſe very name *Peter* ſubſtituted by Chriſt himſelf to his original name *Simon*, ſignifies a *Rock*, on which rock the Redeemer ſaid he would build his Church? if Chriſtianity be founded on the Apoſtles becauſe they taught the Chriſtian religion, it muſt be founded in the firſt place on *Peter:* becauſe he firſt of all men confeſſed Jeſus Chriſt to be by nature ſon of the living God: for he diſtinguiſhed him from John Baptiſt, *Jeremy*, *Elias*, and the other prophets, who were all by adoption ſons of the living God; he firſt announced the Goſpel of J. Chriſt after the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt on the day of Pentecoſt, and by his miniſtry were added on that day—" *proſetitheſan.*" as if three thouſand ſouls to that flock which Chriſt himſelf had formed and committed to *Peter's* care, *John* xxi.; and in the Council of Jeruſalem he told the Apoſtles there preſent: " Men, brethren, you know that in former " days God made choice amongſt us that from my " mouth the nations ſhould hear the word of the Goſ- " pel and believe:" *Acts* xv. 'Tis therefore true that *Peter* was the firſt who after J. Chriſt announced his Goſpel both to the Jews and the Gentiles; and equally true that the Apoſtles knew it. They are the men, who atteſt it. Hence upon all occaſions they name him firſt, and ſometimes contra-diſtinguiſh him: thus —" theſe are the names of the twelve Apoſtles:" " *protos*, *Simon* called *Peter*, and *Andrew* his brother " *James* . . . . . ."—*Matt.* ix. 2.

" And he (J. C.) impoſed on *Simon* the name *Peter* " and

" and *James* ..... and *John* ..... and *Andrew*. ....."—*Mark* iii. 16.

" And when 'twas day he called his disciples and " chose twelve from amongst them whom he called " Apostles, *Simon*, whom he called *Peter*, and *An-* " *drew*, *James* and *John* ....."—*Luke* xvi. 13.

" Taking *Peter* and the two sons of *Zebedee* ..... he says to *Peter*. His words were addressed to *Peter* though he spoke to them in the plural number. *Matt.* xxvi. 37, 40.

" Jesus took *Peter*, *James* and *John*."—*Mark* ix. 2.

The Angel says to the women: " Go tell his disci- " ples, and *Peter*, that he goes before you to Galilee. xvi. 7."

Was not *Peter* one of the disciples? why does the Angel distinguish him from the other disciples if in reality there was no distinction? was the Angel a babler, who multiplied words to no purpose?

" They said to *Peter* and to the Apostles."—*Acts* ii. 37. In this passage St. *Luke* distinguishes *Peter* from the other Apostles. Did he also multiply words in vain?

St. *Paul*, in his Epistle to the Galatians, says: " af- " ter three years I went up to Jerusalem to inquire of " *Peter*," " *istoresai Petron*," and remained with him " fifteen days."—*Gal.* i. 18.

The Galatians had been taught to believe by some self constituted teachers, that the ceremonies of the Jewish law obliged the Christians. Against these the Apostle justifies his doctrine; to remove the impressions made against him by these artful innovators, who told the people that his doctrine was not consistent with that of the other Apostles, because he was not one of the twelve sent immediately by J. Christ, St. *Paul* says that he had been to see *Peter*, and remained with him fifteen days. And in the next chapter he says, that fourteen years after he went up again, and compared his Gospel with that taught by the other Apostles. Tho' the

the Apoſtle knew that his doctrine was revealed to him by J. Chriſt, and authorized by miracles, yet he thought it neceſſary, in order to remove all falſe impreſſions and ſuſpicions, to ſhew that 'twas perfectly conſiſtent with *Peter's* doctrine. St. *Paul* thus ſet an example to future ages. If it had been followed, the peace of the Chriſtian world would not have been ſo often diſturbed by innovations, and pretended reformations.

The Ex. adduces ſome texts of Scripture to ſhew that Chriſt did not intend to eſtabliſh any pre-eminence amongſt his Apoſtles. The Arians adduced many texts to ſhew that Chriſt was not God; the Neſtorians to ſhew that in him were two perſons, and the Eutychians thought ſome texts clearly ſhewed that in J. Chriſt there was but one nature; 'twas reſerved for this Rev. Ex. and his potent Ally the mock P. to ſhew that J. Chriſt was the founder of a jacobinical ſociety, a ſociety without order or ſubordination: for without ſome pre-eminence there can be none. Admire the man's ſagacity: he has diſcovered that J. C. did not intend to do, what he has done if the Evangeliſts tell truth, and what he muſt have done if he had the firſt elements of common ſenſe.

A text from the Alcoran would have been as much to the purpoſe as thoſe which the Ex. quotes from the Goſpel in ſupport of his extravagance, for an opinion it can't be called. The Saviour had ſaid, "if any man "deſire to be firſt, he will be laſt:"—and, "every man "who exalts himſelf will be humbled."—*Matt.* xxiii. In both places J. Chriſt condemns ambition. What is that to the purpoſe? what Chriſtian ever thought ambition laudable till one of *Luther's* diſciples ſanctified the boaſting of his maſter? if St. *Peter* had deſired a pre-eminence over the Apoſtles, he never would have obtained it, nor even the laſt place amongſt them; his ambition would have excluded him; but we muſt preſume that the ſpirit of humility which the Saviour recommended

commended is not inconſiſtent with the exerciſe of authority and power, which is from God, and to which St. *Paul* enjoins obedience: "Remember your guides, "who announced to you the word of God . . . . . imi- "tate their faith . . . . obey your guides and be ſub- "ject to them."—*Heb.* xiii.

Would this Ex. condeſcend to inform us if there be none poſſeſſed of any pre-eminence in the Church, who were theſe guides to whom St. *Paul* ordered the faithful to be ſubject? the reader need not be told that the Apoſtle calls their teachers and paſtors *Guides*, becauſe 'tis their official duty to conduct them in the paths of ſalvation.

The Ex. finds another text in which the Saviour told the Apoſtles that they were all brethren. What then? did not the Saviour even after his reſurrection call his diſciples brethren: "go to my brethren and tell them." *John* xx. 17. Was he leſs their Lord and Maſter? if the Ex. had read the 11th verſe of the ſame chapter, he would have ſeen that one of the diſciples was the greater, and miniſter to them all. "*ô de meizôn ûmon* "*eſtai ûmon diakonas.*" Theſe words which he quotes were, ſays our Ex. ſubſequent to the promiſe. True —but they were not ſubſequent to the performance of that promiſe, *John* xvi. when Chriſt conſtituted *Peter* paſtor and teacher of his flock; and if they had been ſubſequent to the performance of the promiſe, they contain nothing but what Chriſt and his Apoſtles always taught, the neceſſity of *humility*, a virtue to which all reformers are ſtrangers, a virtue as diametrically oppoſite to *Luther's holy boaſting*, as Heaven is to Hell.

The Ex. pretends that expreſſions nearly ſimilar to the promiſes made to *Peter* were applied to the other Apoſtles. 'Tis rather unlucky that the Evangeliſts forgot them: there are none ſuch to be found in their writings: where, or to which of the Apoſtles did Chriſt ſay, "I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom "of Heaven? to which of the other Apoſtles did he

ſay: "I have prayed for thee that thy faith ſhould not "ceaſe?" which of them did he order after his converſion to confirm his brethren, or to which of them did he ſay after exacting a teſtimony of his love: "Feed my lambs, rule my ſheep, feed my ſheep? a power of binding and looſing he gave them all, hence the Biſhops; who are the ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles, exerciſe theſe powers of binding by inflicting canonical cenſures, and enjoining penitential works; and alſo by enacting local ordinances, which oblige their reſpective flocks; and the powers of looſing they exerciſe by diſpenſing in particular laws upon ſolid reaſons, but with due ſubordination to the Chief Paſtor, to whom J. Chriſt committed the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the care of the whole flock; that is, the plenitude of eccleſiaſtical power.

As an argument againſt *Peter's* ſupremacy the Ex. quotes a paſſage from one of that Apoſtle's Epiſtles, to which he affixes a ſenſe of his own invention. For the readers information the paſſage is here given entire: "I myſelf a Prieſt," *ſumpreſbuteros* "exhort the "Prieſts who are amongſt you,"—"*tous preſbuterous* "*en umin parakalo*" . . . . "feed the flock of God "which is amongſt you;"—"*poimenate to en úmin* "*poimnion.*" . . . . . "ſuperintending,"—"*epiſcopoun-* "*tes*:" "not domineering over the Clergy."—*kataku-* "*rieuentes tón kleron.*"

'Tis the firſt time, perhaps, that the actual exerciſe of a man's official duty was adduced as an authority againſt his juriſdiction. The Apoſtle directs the Epiſcopal Paſtors of the provinces of Pontus, Galatia, Cappidocia, Aſia, and Bythinia, to whom his letter is addreſſed, to feed the reſpective portions of the flock over which they preſided, "*to en úmin poimnion*," not thro' compunction but willingly, not in view of filthy lucre, but cheerfully; not to lord it over the inferior Clergy but in their own conduct to ſet an example of all Chriſtian virtues to the flock. Will the Ex. admit that

that theſe Paſtors, whom the Apoſtle ordered to ſuperintend the flock amongſt themſelves were poſſeſſed of any ſpiritual authority? if not the Apoſtle's inſtruction was ludicrous, a meer mockery; and his prohibition of a domineering ſpirit unneceſſary: no man ever was known to domineer over perſons not under his controul; nor is it poſſible for a man to domineer in whom no authority is acknowledged or veſted. The Ex. by his own private authority has ſubſtituted the terms "*as* "*being Lords over God's heritage*," to St. *Peter's* words, "*not domineering over the Clergy.*" Thus the unlearned are duped and miſled by arbitrary verſions, which each new teacher adapts to his own opinions. Even the Ex'rs. verſion will not bear him out. For if they had no pre-eminence, no authority or juriſdiction, they could not lord it over *God's heritage.* The Apoſtles injunction would have been miſapplied.

St. *Peter* directs all theſe ſubordinate Paſtors to practice the ſame virtues, which J. Chriſt, whom he calls the Prince of Paſtors, "*Archipoimon*," had taught both by word and example, that is, humility, modeſty and meekneſs, virtues indiſpenſably neceſſary in all Chriſtians, but more eſpecially in the Paſtors of the Church, who are ſtrictly obliged to inſtruct others by example as well as by words.

The Ex'rs. next attempt to ſhew that no pre-eminence was eſtabliſhed by J. Chriſt is extremely unlucky: in the whole Scriptures he could not have choſen a paſſage leſs to his purpoſe, not one which more clearly and diſtinctly authenticates that very pre-eminence againſt which he pretends to reaſon.— "At Epheſus St. *Paul* called together the elders of "the Church, and exhorted them to take heed to "themſelves and to all the flock over which the Holy "Ghoſt had made them overſeers, to feed the Church "of God."—*Acts* xx. 28. This ſtatement of the Ex. is inconſiſtent with St. *Luke's* account, and his verſion incorrect: 'twas not at Epheſus that St. *Paul* called

the Aſſembly: St. *Luke* ſays, "that *Paul* having ſent "from Melitus to Epheſus,"—"*apotés Melitou pemp-*"*ſas eis Epheſon.*"—"ſent for the Prieſts of the "Church,"—"*meta kàleſato tous preſbuterous tés Ec-*"*cleſiás.*"—*ibidem* 17. He did not ſend for all the old men of the Church of Epheſus, nor for the inferior Clergy, ſuch an aſſembly would have given offence to the heathen magiſtrates in Melitas, and was totally unneceſſary. He ſent for the Biſhops whom the Holy Ghoſt, by the miniſtry of the Apoſtles, had placed over the Church in that province. And to them his words are addreſſed: "attend to yourſelves and to "the whole flock in which the Holy Ghoſt has placed "you Biſhops to rule the Church of God, which he "purchaſed with his blood."—*ibidem* 28.

Is this Oxford ſcholar yet to learn that the Greek word "*Epiſcopos*," and the Latin "*Epiſcopus*," ſignifies neither leſs nor more than what we call in plain Engliſh *Biſhop?* he has recourſe to the etymology of the word in order to miſlead the ignorant, and teach them to believe that St. *Paul* was giving his inſtructions, not to the firſt Paſtors of the flock in the whole Province, but to a few old men in Epheſus. Yet all efforts to wreſt St. *Luke's* words from the intended ſignification are fruitleſs: the Ex. himſelf is forced to acknowledge that theſe men to whom the Apoſtle ſpoke were placed by the Holy Ghoſt to feed the flock; they were therefore Paſtors of the Holy Ghoſt's appointment, conſequently had power, authority, juriſdiction and pre-eminence from him to feed and rule, as the Greek term "*poimaoute*" literally ſignifies.

It may not be amiſs to inform the reader that the power and juriſdiction of the Saviour is expreſſed in the prophecy applied to him, *Matt.* ii. In the ſame terms, by which St. *Paul*, in this paſſage and in his Epiſtle to the Hebrews, expreſſes the authority of the Paſtors of the Church: "*égoumenos oſtis poimanei ton laon mou* "*iſrael*," Thereby giving us to underſtand that the power

power which they exercise is derived from him. Of this truth we have elsewhere the most incontrovertible evidence:—"On whom you will see the spirit descending and remaining on him, this is he, who baptises in the Holy Ghost. I saw and I have attested that he is the Son of God."—*John* i. 33.

"After these things Jesus came with his disciples to the land of Judea, and he abode there with them and baptized."—*John* iii. 22.

Here the Evangelist says expressly that Jesus baptised; in the next chapter, he says:—"When therefore the Lord knew that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus makes and baptizes more disciples than *John*, though *Jesus* himself did not baptise but his disciples *did*."—*John* iv. 1. 'Tis therefore manifest that Jesus himself administered this sacrament by the hands of his ministers; and equally manifest that he continues to teach and administer the Sacraments in his Church by his ministers to the present day, and will till the consummation in virtue of his promise: go "teach all nations baptising them in the name of the "Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and "behold I am with you all days till the consummation of the age."—*Matt. ult.*

Every man, who reads the Scriptures must know, that whenever God says by himself or by his prophets, that he will be with any person, the success of the undertaking however arduous, though surpassing the power of men and Angels, is notwithstanding infallibly certain. Thus for instance, when God ordered *Moses* to go to *Pharaoh* and bring up his people from Egypt, *Moses*, to whom such an undertaking seemed absolutely impossible, replied: who am I to go to *Pharaoh? Exod.* iii. 12. The Lord to assure him, answered: "I will "be with you." The success was insured by his presence.

The same promise was made to *Josue* and with the same success; "No man will be able to resist you all the

" the days of your life; as I was with *Moſes*, I will be " with you."—*Jos.* i. 5.

A ſimilar promiſe with equal ſucceſs was made to *Gideon:* " The Lord ſaid to him I will be with you, " and you will ſmite *Madian* as one man." *Jud.* vi. 16.

Though the converſion of all nations be a more arduous and difficult undertaking than that of *Moſes*, *Joſue*, or *Gideon*, 'tis not too great for Almighty Power, and the promiſe of J. Chriſt to his miniſters is more expreſſive: " I am with you all days till the conſumma- " tion of the age:" he thus excludes the moſt diſtant idea of an interruption in the great work of the converſion of all nations till the end of time.

The Ex. proceeds to ſhew what no man denies or doubts, that the term *Church* may be applied to any aſſembly, and is frequently in the Scriptures; he might have added that it ſometimes ſignifies the building in which the Aſſembly meets—as we ſay, St. *Peter's* Church—St. *Paul's* Church. This would have been as much to his purpoſe; but, ſays he, as the term is applicable to the whole body of Chriſtians, the promiſe of Chriſt is not confined to one ſet of men in excluſion of all others. He had juſt told us that the term *Church* is applied to any aſſembly—immediately ſhifts his ground, and confines it to the whole body of Chriſtians. Was that Church which *David* called a Church of the wicked a part of this new invented Church? " *Sinethi kahel mirehim*;" *Ps.* xxvi. 5.—was that tumultuous aſſembly at Epheſus, which St. *Luke* three ſeveral times calls a Church a part of this new Church? *Acts* xix. There are Churches therefore which are no parts nor portions of the Church of J. C. for theſe, of which *David* and St. *Luke* ſpeak moſt certainly were not. The Ex. juſtly remarks that the promiſes of Chriſt are not confined to one ſet of men in excluſion of all others, and of courſe that all who wiſh to partake of the inheritance of Chriſt muſt become members of that Church: for he will ſhare his inheritance

inheritance but with his children. The promiſes of J. Chriſt are confined to that ſociety, which he himſelf founded, which he called his own Church, in excluſion of all other Churches; againſt which he ſaid the powers of hell would not prevail. From this Church none are excluded who ſincerely deſire to become members of it; and conſequently none are excluded from the promiſes of Chriſt, but theſe who exclude themſelves.

The Saviour did not ſay in general, "I will found a Church," but he ſaid, "I will found my Church," "*oikodomeſó mou tén ekkleſian.*" *Matt.* xvi. He did not found many ſocieties differing from each other in articles of faith and terms of communion; he founded but *one*, in which *one* and the ſame faith is believed and profeſſed: "*one Lord, one faith*," ſaid St. *Paul* to the Epheſians: *Eph.* iv. 5.—and in his ſecond to the Corinthians, he ſays: "having the ſame ſpirit of "faith," 2 *Cor.* iv. 13. To this one ſociety or Church the Saviour added daily theſe who were to be ſaved, "*ſozomenous*," in that one ſociety he teaches and adminiſters the ſacraments by the miniſtry of theſe Paſtors whom he has given for the perfection of the ſaints, and to it he will add thoſe who are to be ſaved till the conſummation.

All ſocieties founded by others at different times are neither parts nor portions of this *one* ſociety, founded by J. Chriſt:—J. Chriſt is a God of truth: he does not teach contradictions. Of all ſocieties, whoſe tenets and terms of communion contradict each other, J. Chriſt can have founded but one: one only and excluſively believes the true faith: for truth is ſimple and indiviſible contains no mixture of falſehood, all the others are not taught by J. Chriſt, for he teaches no falſehood: they do not profeſs the religion taught by J. Chriſt: for he taught nothing but truth, and in his doctrine there is no mixture of error.

That the promiſes of Chriſt do not extend to ſocie-

ties

ties of Chriſtians profeſſing a doctrine not taught by Chriſt, we know from St. *Paul:* the Galatians to whom his Epiſtle is addreſſed were Chriſtians, taking the term in a certain latitude: they believed in J. Chriſt, but they were alſo taught to believe by ſome reformers that the ceremonies of the Jewiſh law obliged in the Chriſtian diſpenſation. Againſt this error the Apoſtle reaſons in his Epiſtle: "I wonder," ſays he, "that you are ſo ſoon transferred from him who "called you in the grace of J. Chriſt to another Goſpel." *Gal.* i. 6. The Apoſtle therefore thought that to believe this error was an abſolute deſertion of J. C. 'twas J. C. who called them to his Church by the grace of faith, and by error they are transferred from him. To juſtify the Goſpel, which he himſelf taught, the Apoſtle ſays: "I did not receive it from man, nor "learn it but by the revelation of J. Chriſt."—*ibidem.* In the next chapter he ſays: "Behold, I *Paul* ſay un- "to you, that if you be circumciſed Chriſt will profit "you nothing . . . . . you ran well, who hindered "you from obeying the truth? this perſuaſion is not "from him, who called you, a little leaven corrupts the "whole maſs."—*v.* 2.

The Apoſtle in the whole of his letter not only teaches but invincibly demonſtrates that error corrupts faith, and ſeparates from J. Chriſt.

The Ex. admits that in virtue of Chriſt's promiſe Satan would never be able to extirpate the Chriſtian religion from the world. It has been already remarked that J. Chriſt did not ſpeak of different ſocieties or denominations of Chriſtians, but of that one ſociety, which he himſelf formed, in which he teaches; from that ſociety Chriſtianity never will be extirpated. In other ſocieties ſome fragments of Chriſtianity may, or may not continue: Chriſt has promiſed them nothing. they have nothing to expect from him. Does the Ex. imagine that Chriſtianity is a compoſition of truth and falſehood? Does he pretend to unite light with darkneſs?

neſs? by Chriſtianity we underſtand that plan of religion taught by J. Chriſt to his Apoſtles, and by their miniſtry made known to the world. In it's ſpeculative doctrines there is nothing but truth; in its moral maxims there is nothing corrupt or impure:—Let the reader attend to the order which he intimated to his Apoſtles when he ſent them to inſtruct and ſanctify the world; in it as in a mirror he may contemplate the whole of the Chriſtian diſpenſation: "all "power in heaven and on earth is given to me: go ye "therefore and teach all nations." What were they ordered to teach? hear what follows: "teaching "them to obſerve all things whatſoever, which I have "commanded you."—*Matt. ult.* But how were the Apoſtles to remember all the things which he had taught them during the ſpace of three or four years which they had paſſed in his company? he had told them, "the Paraclete, the Holy Ghoſt, whom the "father will ſend in my name, he will teach you all "things and remind you of all the things which I have ſaid to you."—*John* xvi. 26.—and to this promiſe he adds: "Behold I am with you all days till the con-"ſummation of the age." This then is Chriſtianity: what J. Chriſt taught his Apoſtles; in it there is nothing falſe, nothing impure; this is the Chriſtianity which will ſubſiſt till the end of time in that Church which was built on the Rock; inſtructed by the wiſdom of the Holy Ghoſt, ſanctified by the preſence of J. Chriſt, protected by his Almighty power it will forever reſiſt the united efforts of earth and hell.

The Ex. concludes this his vith. Propoſition, by ſaying, "that as J. Chriſt did not treat *Peter* with "any peculiar marks of attention, or employ him in "any authoritative office it does not ſeem that Chriſt "himſelf underſtood his words as conveying ſuch an "authority." Would the Ex. inform us, by what form of words Chriſt could convey ſuch an authority if he intended it? we plain men know no words more

 expreſſive,

expreſſive, or more to the purpoſe than theſe: "Feed "my lambs, feed my ſheep: that the Saviour did not underſtand his own words to convey any authority if ſomething worſe thon nonſenſe: 'tis blaſphemy. Does the Ex. believe the Evangeliſt when he ſays that by *him* all things were made? can he prevail on himſelf to believe that to feed Chriſt's flock is an authoritative commiſſion? if he induces any other man to believe that 'twas not, that man muſt be fond of deluſion.

Whilſt the Saviour viſible and in his mortal ſtate fed his flock in perſon, 'twas not neceſſary to employ *Peter* or any other of his diſciples; but when he withdrew his viſible preſence from his flock, the greateſt mark of attention was to entruſt them to *Peter's* care.

In his viith. Propoſition the Ex. ſays, "that in P*eter's* "ſpeeches and letters, he aſſumed no pre-eminence "which would have given additional weight to his "precepts and exhortations." 'Tis matter of ſurpriſe that this Ex. does not ſee a viſible contradiction in his own words: to give precepts and exhortations is it not to aſſume an authority? 'tis irkſome to reaſon with a man who does not underſtand himſelf. P*eter* practiſed that modeſty which he every where inculcates; he ſtyled himſelf an Apoſtle of J. Chriſt: his miracles authorized the quality which he aſſumed, and the doctrine which he taught. If the Ex. had read the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, he would have found that P*eter* did aſſert his ſupremacy in the firſt Council: he told the Apoſtles there preſent, "that they knew that "in former days God had made choice of him amongſt "them, that by his mouth the nations ſhould hear the "faith and believe.

In his next Propoſition, the Ex. acutely as he thinks, remarks that St. *Matthew* is the only one of the Evangeliſts who mention this promiſe made by Chriſt to *Peter*; that St. *Mark* and St. *Luke* relate the ſame ſtory, totally omitting that paſſage. Does he inſinuate that St. *Matthew* advanced a falſehood? or that though

Chriſt

Chriſt did actually ſpeak theſe words they convey no idea? that the words of J. Chriſt are mere empty ſounds? he alſo remarks that St. *John* is the only Evangeliſt, who relates theſe words of Chriſt to *Peter*, "feed my lambs, feed my ſheep," is not the teſtimony of St. *John* ſufficient for any man who believes the Scriptures infallible? were not the other Apoſtles preſent when theſe words were ſpoken? does the Ex. know the doctrine, which the Apoſtles taught better than the Churches which were formed and inſtructed by them? there are but few of the Apoſtles, who wrote any thing; their inſtructions were by oral tradition, and theſe we know by the teſtimony and from the invariable practice of the Churches where they preached, and in which their inſtructions were given.

The Ex. thinks he finds ſome reaſon to ſuſpect St. *Matthew's* and St. *John's* account in the ſilence of the other Evangeliſts. The omiſſion, he ſays, proves that the Evangeliſts conſidered them as of little conſequence. What! is the ſilence of one Evangeliſt ſufficient to invalidate the poſitive aſſertion of the other? by this mode of reaſoning we ſhall conclude that *Matthew* did not think the circumciſion of J. Chriſt a matter of conſequence: he omits it; that *Mark* did not think the preſentation in the temple of any conſequence; though the Catholic Church celebrates a ſolemn feſtival in commemoration of theſe myſteries; that St. *Luke* thought the appearance of the ſtar in the eaſt trifling, and that St. *John* conſiderered the birth of J. Chriſt of a Virgin a trifling circumſtance, does the Ex. imagine that theſe truths of religion were not taught by theſe Evangeliſts as well as by the other Apoſtles, though omitted in their Goſpels. The cauſe muſt be totally defenceleſs, which has recourſe to ſuch artifices; they can hardly impoſe on ignorance; they don't even form the ſhadow of an argument.

"If," ſays our Ex. "the Chriſtian Church ever "ſtood in need of a ſpiritual and infallible guide, and

" infallible ruler, 'twas in the diſtreſſing times imme-
" diately after the death of Chriſt; and we might have
" expected to have ſeen *Peter* ſupplying the place of
" his deceaſed maſter, and directing his ardent zeal to
" the exerciſe of his deputed authority."—*p.* 69. Nothing like it appears.

This is the moſt extraordinary paſſage which the Writer has yet ſeen penned by any man, who calls himſelf a Chriſtian. The Ex. not only denies the infallibility of *Peter*, which he ignorantly confounds with his ſpiritual authority, but alſo the infallibility of all the Apoſtles, and thereby at one ſtroke ruins the infallible authority of the whole New Teſtament: for if the Apoſtles were not infallible, the New Teſtament may or may not be true: 'twas written by them or their immediate diſciples; but it moſt certainly is not infallible if they were not ſo. To this firſt impiety, a yet greater is added: the Redeemer is introduced as a dead man—*his deceaſed maſter*. It ſeems this Revd. Ex. does not believe the reſurrection of J. Chriſt—we Chriſtians do. 'Twas after his reſurrection that he authoriſed *Peter* to feed his flock—*ſee the* xxi. *of John*.—He was not then a *deceaſed Maſter*, but a living Lord in his immortal ſtate.

The Ex. does not ſeem to have read the Acts of the Apoſtles: was it not *Peter* who directed the Apoſtles to proceed to the election of *Matthias?* his ſpeech upon the occaſion is given in the firſt chapter. 'Tis true *Peter* did not conſtitute *Matthias* independently; as all the Apoſtles were choſen by J. Chriſt immediately, St. *Peter* did not think proper to deprive him, who was to be of the number, of that privilege. Hence the choice of a ſubſtitute to *Judas* the traitor was referred to J. Chriſt:—" Thou, O Lord, who art the ſearcher
" of hearts ſhew one of theſe two, whom thou haſt
" choſen." *Acts* i. 24.

The Deacons were required by the Apoſtles: 'tis preſumed they did not all ſpeak at the ſame inſtant: order

order was eſtabliſhed amongſt them, not confuſion. The Deacons, though elected by the people, were ordained by the Apoſtles. St. *Luke* does not ſpecify by whom; 'tis enough for us to know that the inſtitution is of divine authority; that their ſpiritual powers were conferred not by the election of the people, but by the impoſition of hands; or as we term it, the ordination of the Apoſtles: "Praying they impoſed hands on "them." *Acts* vi. 6.

The Apoſtles invariably ſpeak of *Peter* in the firſt place, and introduce him ſpeaking upon every public occaſion. If the Ex. has not ſeen it 'tis becauſe he has not read the New Teſtament attentively, if at all—he has conſequently that part of his faith as yet to look for.

Peter, ſays the Ex. *p.* 70, was ſent by the other Apoſtles to Samaria, to inſtruct the new Converts: he thence concludes that *Peter* had no authority over them.

If being ſent argues inferiority, *Peter* was therefore inferior to the others; conſequently there was ſome pre-eminence eſtabliſhed amongſt them. In error there is nothing conſiſtent. In like manner we muſt conclude that *Phineas* the High Prieſt was inferior to the people who ſent him to the children of *Ruben* and *Gad.*—*Jos.* xxii. 13. *Peter* and *John* were ſent amicably by the brethren, not authoritatively—as was the High Prieſt *Phineas:* no Apoſtle ever pretended to be *Peter's* ſuperior.

The Ex. miſtakes the object of their miſſion—'twas not to inſtruct the new converts: they had been previouſly inſtructed and baptized by St. *Philip*, the Deacon; 'twas to adminiſter to them the ſacrament of confirmation, a ſacrament which the Deacon could not adminiſter, that they might receive the plenitude of the Holy Ghoſt, to enable them to reſiſt the violence of perſecution: we read in the viii. Chapter of the Acts, that they were baptiſed, but, had not yet received the

Holy

Holy Ghoſt, that is that plenitude of grace, which is neceſſary to enable the faithful to profeſs their faith in times of perſecution. That by baptiſm they had received the Holy Ghoſt, or if you will the grace of the Holy Ghoſt to the cleanſing them from ſin is manifeſt from St. *Peter's* words, " Repent, and let each of you " be baptiſed in the name of J. Chriſt to the remiſſion " of ſins." Hence in the viii. chapter we do not read of any inſtruction given to theſe new converts by *Peter* and *John*, " they prayed for them that they might re- " ceive the Holy Ghoſt . . . . . then they impoſed " hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghoſt." *Acts* viii. 15, 17.

The controverſy in the Council of Jeruſalem, *Acts* xv. ſays the Ex. was diſcuſſed by the Apoſtles and elders, and decided by them, *p.* 70. If he had ſaid that *Peter's* deciſion had been adopted by the Council, he would have told us what is there related. That controverſy might have been infallibly decided by any one of the Apoſtles; but the Holy Ghoſt to whom the deciſion is there aſcribed, aſſembled this firſt Council as a precedent to future ages, and an effectual means of deciding all controverſies till the end of time; a precedent which the Catholic Church has invariably followed.

The Ex. ſeems to lay great ſtreſs on the term *Elder*, which in our language ſignifies a man ſtricken in years: 'tis the comparative of *old*; he thereby miſleads the unlearned, teaching them to believe that all the old men of the Church were conſulted on theſe occaſions. Why not tell his readers that the Greek term *preſbuteros*, which he tranſlates *elder*, bears a different ſignification in the New Teſtament, as well as in the writings of all the Greek fathers; that it ſignifies a clergyman whether he be old or young. The Ex. quotes the xiv. chapter of the *Acts*, in which 'tis ſaid that " El- " ders were appointed in every Church." He muſt be fond of deception whom this verſion deceives: Age makes

makes an *elder*, he is conſtituted an old man by length of days, not by men. St *Luke*, author of the Acts of the Apoſtles, relates in the moſt intelligible language the ordination of prieſts by the Apoſtles P*aul* and *Barnaby*, without ſpecifying whether they were old or young: " they returned to Lyſtra and Iconium . . . . . " confirming the ſouls of the faithful, exhorting them " to perſevere in the faith, and that 'tis through many " tribulations they muſt enter into the kingdom of God, " and ordaining prieſts for them by impoſition of hands " in each Church, *Cheirotoneſantes de autois preſbute-* " *rous kat 'ekkleſian*, praying with faſting, they (the " Ap.) recommended them to the Lord in whom they believed." *Acts* xiv.—Thus St. *Luke* relates the tranſaction.

Does the impoſition of hands make a man old? does it make him an Elder? 'tis a melancholy reflection to think that ſo many well meaning men are duped by ſuch artifices: they are referred to the Scriptures and miſled by falſe verſions. That of theſe prieſts thus appointed by the Apoſtles many were not old, we know from the beſt authority.

St. *Timothy*, an Archbiſhop, ordained by St. P*aul*, and left expreſſly by the Apoſtle to conſtitute *theſe Elders*, as the Ex. calls them, in the different Churches of the juriſdiction of Epheſus, was himſelf ſo far from being an *Elder*, that the Apoſtle feared his youth might be a prejudice againſt him: " Preach theſe " things and teach them, let no man contemn thy " youth." 1 *Tim.* iv. 12.—and in the next chapter he directs him to give a double retribution to theſe prieſts, who worthily preſide. Here we ſee the prieſts preſiding over their reſpective flocks, and *Timothy* a youth, or if the Ex. chuſes, to call him a young *Elder*, preſiding over them all; and not only preſiding but juridically pronouncing: for St. P*aul* directs him not to receive an accuſation againſt a prieſt but on the teſtimony of two or three witneſſes; *ibid.* 19. and orders him not

to

to impoſe hands haſtily on any man; 22. 'Twas by impoſition of hands, not by length of days that prieſts were ordained. 'Twas thus that *Timothy* himſelf in early youth was ordained a prieſt by St. *Paul:* "for "this cauſe," ſaid the Apoſtle, "I admoniſh thee to "rekindle the grace of God which is in thee by the impoſition of my hands. 2 *Tim.* i. 6. In another place he exhorts him not to neglect the grace of God which was given him by prophecy with the impoſition of hands of the prieſthood—1 *Tim.* iv. 14. 'Twas by the impoſition of the Apoſtles' hands that the prieſthood was conferred on *Timothy*; and by the ſame ceremony *Timothy* ordained others, and conſtituted them prieſts whether old or young, to preſide over the Churches entruſted to their care. Hence St. *Paul* calls them "*proeſtótes preſbuteroi*," preſiding prieſts. 1 *Tim.* v. 17.

St. *Paul*, ſays the Ex. *p.* 70, declares "that he was "nothing behind the *chiefeſt* of the Apoſtles." If this verſion be correct, it follows that St. *Paul* acknowledged that there was a *Chief* amongſt the Apoſtles, and not only a *Chief*, but one that was *Chiefeſt*. This the Ex. denies. As the verſion is incorrect, the remark is made to ſhew how inconſiſtent this Ex. is with himſelf.

St. *Paul* in the paſſage alluded, did not ſpeak a word of his own, or the authority of any of the Apoſtles: he related his labours and ſufferings for the Church, and ſaid that he was not in them inferior to thoſe who were above meaſure Apoſtles: "*ouden gar* "*úſtereſa tôn úper lian Apoſtolón.*" 2 *Cor.* xii. 11.

In the next text by which the Ex. pretends that St. *Paul* ſpoke of himſelf as upon an equality with *Peter*; the Apoſtle informs the Galatians, that he himſelf was called in an extraordinary manner by J. Chriſt to be a teacher of the heathen nations, *Gal.* i. as *Peter* had beſides his general charge of the whole flock a particular charge of the Jews. St. *Paul* ſays nothing of his own

own or of *Peter's* authority in expreſs terms, but from the whole of that letter *Peter's* authority in matters of faith is evidently deduced: St. *Paul* ſays, *Gal* i. that after his converſion he did not go to Jeruſalem to the Apoſtles, who were before him, for inſtruction, becauſe he had his goſpel by the revelation of J. Chriſt; yet three years after he went up to ſee *Peter*; he did not ſay that he went up to ſee *James*, though *James* was then biſhop of Jeruſalem, and St. *Paul* ſaw him there. The Apoſtle therefore knew that *Peter* was ſuperior to *James*, even in the very city over which he preſided as Biſhop. St. *Chryſoſtome*, Patriarch, of Conſtantinople ſays, in his laſt Homily on the Goſpel of St. *John*, on theſe words, "*follow me:*" "by theſe words "he ſhews his care and friendly affection to him; (P.) "but if any man aſks why *James* received the See of "Jeruſalem, I would anſwer that *Peter*, the teacher of "the world, had conſtituted him."

Again the Apoſtle ſays, *Gal.* ii. "then fourteen "years after, I went up again to Jeruſalem with *Bar*"*naby*, taking *Titus* alſo. And I went up according "to revelation, and communicated to them the goſpel, "which I preach in the nations, but apart to thoſe, "who ſeem to be ſomething, leaſt I ſhould have run in "vain; but neither *Titus* who was with me being a "Greek, was compelled to be circumciſed."

Thus St. *Paul* juſtifies his doctrine by having ſubmitted it to *Peter*, *James* and *John*, and their approbation he expreſſes by ſaying: "the right hand of com"munion they gave to me and to *Barnaby*, that we "ſhould go to the nations, and they to the circumci"ſion."—*ibid.* 9.

If St. *Paul* ſays that the goſpel of the in-circumciſion, that is of the uncircumciſed nations, was committed to him, and of the circumciſion or of the Jews to *Peter*, he does not intend to exclude the other Apoſtles from their ſhare in the miniſtry; but he tells the Galatians that he had a particular grace and vocation for

the converſion of the heathens, as St. Peter had a particular grace and vocation for the converſion of the Jews: "for he who wrought in *Peter* to the Apoſtle-"ſhip of the circumciſion, wrought in me alſo amongſt "the Gentiles."

St. *Paul* preached to the Jews occaſionally: his commiſſion though chiefly, was not excluſively confined to the Gentiles: thus we read, "and the Lord ſaid unto "him: go for this man (Pa.) is a veſſel of election to "me, to carry my name before the Gentiles and "Kings, and the children of Iſrael."—*Acts* ix. 13, 14.

And his epiſtle to the Hebrews is addreſſed to the Jews.

In like manner we know that *Peter's* miſſion was not confined to the Jews, though he had a particular grace for their converſion: he himſelf declared at the Council of Jeruſalem, "that the Apoſtles knew 'twas "by his mouth the heathen nations were to hear the "word of God and believe."—*Acts* xv.

And in the firſt chapter of the *Acts* the Saviour ſays to his Apoſtles, of whom *Peter* was one: "you will "be my witneſſes in Jeruſalem and in all Judea, and "Samaria, and to the extremities of the earth." Now 'tis manifeſt that *Peter's* particular charge was more honorable than *Paul's*—becauſe in it *Paul* himſelf and all the other Apoſtles are included; becauſe 'twas the particular charge of J. Chriſt himſelf: "I am not ſent "ſaid the Saviour, but to the ſheep which periſhed of "the houſe of Iſrael." And St. *Paul* to the Romans, ſays in expreſs terms, that *Chriſt was the miniſter of the circumciſion.*—*Rom.* xv. In the ſame epiſtle he compares the believing Jews to the olive tree, and the believing Gentiles to the wild olive, which was engrafted on the ſtock: *ibid.* xi. To ſhew the ſuperiority of the Jews ſpeaking to the Gentiles, he ſays: —"Boaſt not "againſt the branches; but if thou boaſt, 'tis not thou "that beareſt the root, but the root thee."—ii. 18.

Hence 'tis manifeſt that St. *Paul* conſidered *Peter* as his

his ſuperior, and ſuperior to the Apoſtles, of this there can be doubt, becauſe he ſays that the Goſpel of the circumciſion was committed to *Peter*, of which he ſays that J. Chriſt was himſelf the miniſter, and tho' all the Apoſtles were ſent immediately by J. Chriſt, as was St. *Paul* himſelf, he does not aſcribe this miniſtry to any one of them. Why ſo? becauſe both he and they were of the circumciſion, and conſequently of St. *Peter's* flock, to whom the miniſtry of the circumciſion was committed; ſo well aſſured was he that *Peter* had been ordered to feed the whole flock; that he had been ordered to confirm his brethren.

The Ex. comes at length to what he calls deciſive evidence againſt *Peter's* infallibility. It has been remarked more than once that if the Ex'rs. reaſon be concluſive, the Chriſtian religion is a mere illuſion. What he calls deciſive evidence againſt *Peter's* infallibility, is deciſive evidence that he himſelf does not believe the New Teſtament infallible. In it we find two of *Peter's* Epiſtles which are ſtript of infallibility by this Revd. Ex. If *Peter* was not infallible in his doctrine, how does he know that *Paul* was infallible? how does he know that *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, and *John* were infallible? was not *Peter* one of the Apoſtles, whom J. Chriſt ordered to teach all nations, promiſing that he himſelf would be with him? what inherent quality or privilege had the other Apoſtles which inſured their doctrine againſt error, to which *Peter* had no claim? and if all the Apoſtles were ſubject to error what are we to think of the New Teſtament? this may account for that new rule of faith of our Ex'rs. invention, that is *caprice*, *fancy*, *prejudice*. What a ſubſtitute to the inſpired writings! this is one of theſe irreſiſtible ſtrokes of eloquence which have enchanted his admirer, Mr. *Cochran*. Fortunately for us Chriſtians his accuſation againſt *Peter* is forged in his own imagination, or in the work-ſhop of his *powerful Ally*: 'tis not founded on St. *Paul's* authority,

whom he groſsly miſrepreſents: St. *Paul* accuſes *Peter* of an error in conduct, not in faith; of an injudicious, perhaps indiſcreet temporizing which might have been productive of bad conſequences, not of teaching falſe doctrine. The Ex. gives the whole paſſage to which he affixes an imaginary ſenſe, a ſenſe not intended by St. *Paul*, and which his words cannot bear. The Writer begs leave to give the paſſage alſo, and at the ſame time to correct the Ex'rs. interpretation: "When *Peter* came to Antioch, I, ſays St. *Paul*, with-"ſtood him to the face, becauſe he was reprehenſible." *Gal.* ii. But for what was he reprehenſible? The Apoſtle proceeds to ſtate the fault, "for, (ſays he,) be-"fore ſome men came from *James* he did eat with the "Gentiles." For this, and this only, *Peter* was reprehenſible. *Peter* was not in an error as this Ex. pretends, he knew that the ceremonial law did not oblige, that doctrine he taught, publicly profeſſed, and authentically declared in the Council of Jeruſalem ſome ſhort time time before: *Acts* xv. "But when they were "come he withdrew, and ſeparated himſelf, fearing "them, who were of the circumciſion." This then is St. *Peter's* fault, an indiſcretion in conduct, which this Ex. has metamorphoſed into an error in faith. St. *Peter* knew, and ſo did St. *Paul*, that the prejudices of the Jews were deeply rooted, he knew that, though the ceremonial law did not oblige the Chriſtians, it might be practiſed without ſin at that time. Hence we find St. *Paul* himſelf, after the decree of the Council of Jeruſalem, with the advice and conſent of St. *James* and the clergy of Jeruſalem practiſing the law: "and the "day following *Paul* went in with us to *James* ..... "thou ſeeſt, brother, how many thouſands there are "amongſt the Jews, who have believed and they are "all zealous for the law. Now they have heard of "thee, that thou teacheſt thoſe Jews, who are amongſt "the Gentiles to forſake *Moſes*, ſaying that they ought "not to circumciſe their children, nor to walk accor-

"ding

" ding to the cuſtom : what is it therefore ? the multi-
" tude muſt indeed come together, for they will hear
" that thou art come. Do therefore this that we ſay
" unto thee : we have four men who have a vow upon
" them, take theſe and purify thyſelf with them, and
" beſtow on them that they may ſhave their heads, and
" all will know that theſe things, which they have
" heard of thee are falſe, but that thou thyſelf alſo
" walkeſt keeping the law. As for thoſe of the Gen-
" tiles who have believed we have written, decreeing
" that they ſhould refrain themſelves from that which
" has been offered to idols and from blood, and from
" things ſtrangled and from fornication. Then *Paul*
" took the men, and the next day being purified with
" them entered into the temple, giving notice of the
" accompliſhment of the days of purification until an
" offering ſhould be offered for every one of them."—
Acts xxi.

Some ſhort time after the Council, we find *Paul* circumciſing *Timothy* to avoid giving offence to the Jews.—*Acts* xvi. Was *Paul* alſo in an error ? was *James* and all the Clergy of Jeruſalem in an error ? were theſe many thouſands of believing Jews, of whom St. *Luke* ſays : " the multitude of the believers had " but one heart and one ſoul.—*Acts* iv. . . . . and " all things were common to them." Were they in error reſpecting one of the moſt important points of the Chriſtian religion ? all theſe not only practiſed the law, but were zealous for the practice of the law. 'Twould have been an error to believe that the obſervance of the Jewiſh law obliged under the penalty of ſin ; but this *Peter* neither believed nor taught : he believed and taught the contrary, ſo did *Paul* and *James* and all the other Apoſtles ; though, to avoid giving offence to the Jews, they occaſionally obſerved the law, as is manifeſt from the paſſages cited juſt now.

In what, you'll ſay, was *Peter's* conduct incorrect ? was he not perfectly juſtifiable to avoid giving offence

to

to the Jews with whom he was in a particular manner charged? did not *Paul* himſelf in conſideration of their prejudices circumciſe his diſciple *Timothy?* did not *James* and the other believing Jews zealouſly obſerve the law? True—yet there muſt have been ſome inadvertent fault in his conduct: for St. Paul ſays that he was reprehenſible: there were ſome falſe teachers, who, to invalidate *Paul's* authority, pretended that his doctrine was not conſiſtent with *Peter's*, which was well known to be the ſtandard of Chriſtian truth. *Peter's* obſervance of the Jewiſh law might give ſome colour of truth to the calumny: *Paul* was therefore ſtrictly correct in reprehending *Peter's* conduct publicly. This argues no ſuperiority in *Paul:* 'twas an act of fraternal correction, not of authority, an act which all ſubordinate Paſtors have a right to exerciſe if they have reaſon to believe that the inadvertence or indiſcretion of the ſuperior's conduct may be prejudicial to others.

St. *Peter's* modeſty in receiving a contradiction from his inferior, without offering any reply in juſtification, or even in extenuation of a fault with which he was publicly charged, ſhews that he practiſed the doctrine, which he taught: if *Peter* had been poſſeſſed with that domineering ſpirit, which he condemns in others, he might have left us a ſpecimen of aſſuming arrogance, inſtead of that apoſtolical meekneſs which appears in all his words and actions, and was eminently conſpicuous in the tranſaction which St. *Paul* relates: for 'tis yet undecided whether his conduct was in itſelf incorrect, though conſidering the calumny which it might indirectly countenance, St. *Paul* was perfectly correct in cenſuring it; and 'twas with reſpect to the ſituation in which *Paul* was placed, and the impediments, which calumny might give his miniſtry, reprehenſible. We don't pretend to juſtify every act of *Peter's* life; that infallibility which we claim for him as an Apoſtle of J. Chriſt, and that ſuperintendance of the flock which was committed to him by his maſter, does

not

not argue an exemption from venial faults: *Peter* was one of thoſe men, whom the Saviour taught to ſay, "*forgive us our treſpaſſes*;" one of theſe of whom St. *John* ſays: "if we ſay we have no ſin, we deceive our-"ſelves, and the truth is not in us." The Saviour had prayed for *Peter* that his faith ſhould not ceaſe.—*Luke* xxii. 32. He did not exempt him from every weakneſs incident to human nature.

Moſes himſelf, though highly favoured, was not totally exempt from human frailty: witneſs his heſitation at the waters of Meriba, which was ſeverely chaſtiſed.

"This paſſage," ſays the Ex. *p.* 72, "is pregnant "with information; it totally deſtroys all idea of *Pe*-"*ter's* infallibility." Thus the Ex. affixing to a paſſage of St. *Paul* a ſenſe as directly oppoſite to that intended by the Apoſtle as truth is to falſehood, or light to darkneſs, attempting to invalidate *Peter's* authority, by direct and neceſſary conſequence invalidates the authority of the New Teſtament, and ſubverts the Chriſtian religion.—What an awful leſſon is here given to the unlearned, when they who are taught to believe that the Scriptures are eaſily underſtood, ſee them ſo groſsly miſtaken by their teachers?

The paſſage is pregnant with information—true—but this Ex. totally miſtakes it: for in it we find that the Apoſtleſhip of the circumciſion, a miniſtry, which Chriſt himſelf had exerciſed, was entruſted to *Peter*; that *Paul* and all the other Apoſtles, who were of the circumciſion, were of his flock; to this plain truth which the Ex. did not ſee, he ſubſtitutes the ravings of his own imagination, and obtrudes them on his readers as the doctrine of St. *Paul*.

The Ex. having, as he imagines, deſtroyed *Peter's* infallibility, and conſequently his ſupremacy. Though infallibility and ſupremacy are totally unconnected; the one may ſubſiſt without the other, as appears from many of the Prophets and Apoſtles who were infallible, though not ſupreme.—Proceeds to ſhew in his ixth.

Propoſition,

Propoſition, that there is no certainty of *Peter's* ever having been at Rome. To this the Writer replies without fearing a contradiction, that there is as great a certainty of his having been at Rome, and Bp. of that city, as that he wrote his firſt and ſecond Epiſtle; that there is as great a certainty of his having eſtabliſhed his See at Rome, as that the Scriptures are divinely inſpired: for we know both the one and the other by the ſame means; that is, by the univerſal and uninterrupted tradition of the Catholic Church; the ſame teſtimony, which renders our aſſent to this fundamental truth of religion, *the Scriptures are divinely inſpired*, infallible, renders it equally unerring, to this truth: *Peter did found his See at Rome, and tranſmitted his authority to feed Chriſt's flock, to his ſucceſſor.* For this was an official authority, not a perſonal quality, and official authority is always veſted in the lawful ſucceſſor, though perſonal qualities or privileges are confined to the perſon.

Doctor *Bull's* concluſion: "it is doubtful whether "St. *Peter* ever was at Rome,"—only ſhews how prejudice and party ſpirit, combined with intereſt, warp the underſtanding; and into what groſs abſurdities every attempt to ſupport error in the face of truth, betrays even men of ſenſe.

"There is not," ſays the Ex. *p.* 73, "one paſſage "in Scripture from which it can be inferred that St. "*Peter* was Biſhop of Rome, or even that he had "ever ſet his foot in that city." Admitting the aſſertion true, though it be totally groundleſs; 'tis not the leſs certain that *Peter* was Biſhop of Rome: for there are many truths of religion which are not to be found in the Scriptures, as has been ſhewn to demonſtration more than once already.

That *Peter* was at Rome is manifeſtly deduced from the Scriptures: for his firſt Epiſtle is dated from Babylon, and that under the name of Babylon, Rome was then underſtood, we know from the Scripture and authentic hiſtory: St. *John*, in the Revelations, ſpeaks

of

of the city of Rome, under the name of Babylon, manifeſtly: *Rev.* xvii. he ſays, 'twas built on ſeven hills, and commanded the kings of the earth, which deſcription is applicable to no other city in the world but Rome at that time: Babylon in Syria was then in ruins, as *Pliny* and *Strabo* inform us; and Babylon in Egypt was but a fort or caſtle. Neither the one or the other of them commanded the Kings of the earth as Rome did at that time.

Euſebius, the father of Church hiſtory better informed than all the modern ſcribblers in Europe, ſays: "*Paphias* (one of the Apoſtles diſciples) ſays this, that "*Peter* in his firſt Epiſtle, which he wrote from Rome "remembered *Mark*; in this Epiſtle he figuratively "called Rome Babylon, ſaying the Church elect which "is in Babylon ſalutes you and my ſon *Mark*."

And St. *Jerome*, a man profoundly verſed in the Scriptures, who with every advantage from nature, and every external adventitious aid, had made them the ſtudy of a long and laborious life; a man to whom even preſumption would not compare Biſhop *Bull*, in his book of illuſtrious men, ſpeaking of St. *Mark*, he ſays: "*Peter* in his firſt Epiſtle, under the name of "Babylon, figuratively ſignifies Rome, ſaying the "Church collected in Babylon ſalutes you."

In the ſame manner this Epiſtle is explained by Greek and Latin writers, *Oecumenius*, *Bede*, &c. when Doctor *Bull* ſets his conjecture in oppoſition to the direct and uncontradicted teſtimony of ſo many intelligent men, who wrote whilſt the fact was yet freſh in the memory of the world, one of whom *Papias* was a cotemporary witneſs, the Doctor, in his great zeal, to render a certain fact ruinous to the reformed ſyſtem, doubtful, has ruined his own credit for veracity. What would the Ex. think of a man who would undertake in defiance of all hiſtorians, to prove that *Alexander* was never in Macedon, or the *Pr. of Orange* in England?

"The circumſtances of *Peter's* having been at

" Rome, (ſays the Ex. *p.* 76,) are very far from being " eſtabliſhed by authentic hiſtory."

The Ex. has been already told that *Peter's* having eſtabliſhed his See at Rome is known from univerſal, uninterrupted, and uncontradicted tradition, the moſt authentic of all hiſtory; becauſe 'tis by it that we know all the revealed truths of religion. The Ex. ſeems to have taken Doctor *Banniſter's* advice, to have conſulted the heathen philoſophers, and thence to have paſſed fifteen centuries of the Chriſtian æra unnoticed. Does he know that during that period there were many eminent writers, Greek and Latin, whoſe works are yet extant? the character of credulity which he ſo liberally beſtows on them without having read a line in their works, may be applied with great propriety to their ſelf-conſtituted cenſors: the man muſt be credulous indeed who can prevail on himſelf to believe that all theſe men, ſo eminent for ſcience and ſanctity, were in error; and that an Apoſtate monk in an obſcure corner in Saxony, a true ſon of *Epicurus*, detected their errors, and re-eſtabliſhed the truth, which they had effaced from the world.

That *Peter* was at Rome, beſides the uninterrupted tradition of the whole Chriſtian world, a fact of which not even a doubt, ever croſſed a man's imagination till *Wiclef's* days in the year 1377, we have the written teſtimony of many unexceptionable writers. *Papias* a cotemporary, *Ireneus*, born at Smyrna, Biſhop of Lyons, who ſuffered martyrdom under *Severus*, in 205, ſays that the Roman Church was founded by *Peter* and *Paul*; 'twas founded firſt by *Peter*, and then by *Peter* and *Paul* together.—*Iren. Lib. 3. Cap. 3.*

Epiphænius, Biſhop of *Salæmina* in Cyprus, a man of unqueſtionable authority, ſays: " the firſt in Rome " were *Peter* and *Paul*—*Pan. Con. Heres.* 17.

Chryſoſtom Patriarch of Conſtantinople, a celebrated writer of the fourth century, ſays: " *Peter* the fiſher- " man, becauſe he occupied the moſt royal city even

" after

" after death, ſhines brighter than the ſun.—*in Ps.* 48.

Paul Oroſius, a moſt acute and diſcriminating hiſtorian, praiſed by St. *Auſtin*, who was a judge of hiſtory if any man ever was, ſays: " in the beginning of the " reign of *Claudius*, *Peter* the Apoſtle of our Lord J. " Chriſt came to Rome, and taught by faithful word " that faith which is ſalutary to all, and by the moſt " powerful virtues approved it, and from that time " Chriſtians began to be at Rome.—*Liv.* 7. *Hist. Cap.* 6.

The great *Theodoret*, whoſe veracity was never called in queſtion, in whoſe writings a ſolid judgment and extenſive erudition are eminently conſpicuous, ſays: " the Great *Peter* was the firſt who delivered to them " (the Romans) the Evangelical doctrine."—*Com. in Epis. Ad. Rom.*

Does the Ex. intend to perſuade us that theſe men who wrote in the third and fourth centuries, did not know who firſt preached the Goſpel at Rome? we ſhall be told bye and bye, that 'tis not certain that *Patrick* was ever in Ireland, or *Auſtin* in England; that *Martin Luther* was not the firſt who taught the reformed doctrine in Wirtemberg. What progreſs theſe new-fangled hiſtorians make in ſcience? with what perſpicuity they undeceive the world?

Perhaps the Emperor *Theodoſius* may have ſome weight with theſe critics: the laws of the Empire were public records, and in them days were believed authentic. Thus we read in the code: " We deſire that all " the people, whom the Empire of our clemency rules, " ſhould remain in the religion which the bleſſed *Peter* " the Apoſtle delivered to the Romans."—*de in Trini. & fide Cath. L. ad. Cunctos.*

Were all the lawyers of the Empire, the Emperor and the Senate, all the citizens of Rome, the inhabitants of Italy, and the neighbouring countries deceived? did they believe that *Peter* had taught the Romans, though no ſuch thing had happened?

That *Peter* died in Rome is a fact of which there cannot be a ſhadow of a doubt: his ſepulchre is there, his bones are there; in no other part of the world was it ſaid or thought at any time that he died. In no other part of the world are his bones preſerved or ſpoken of; 'twas univerſally believed in the Eaſt and in the Weſt, for 1400 years, when *Wiclef*, an ignorant innovator pretended to doubt it.

St. *Ignatius*, who lived with the Apoſtle, was ſucceſſor to *Evodius*, who ſucceeded St. *Peter* in the See of Antioch, when on his way to Rome, where he ſuffered martyrdom in the year 107. Writing to the Romans, ſays: "I do not as *Peter* and *Paul* command "you: they were Apoſtles: I am an inconſiderable "perſon." He alludes to the martyrdom of *Peter* and *Paul*, which happened ſometime before, expreſſing a ſtrong deſire that the Romans would give no impediment to his own: a great part of this letter is recited by St. *Jerome*, in his book of illuſtrious men, *Uſher* gives it entire.

Euſebius relates that *Dennis* the Corinthian, who flouriſhed ſome ſhort time after the Apoſtles, ſaid at Rome: "*Peter* and *Paul* were teaching at the ſame "time in this city, and were crowned with martyrdom "at the ſame time."—*Lib. 2. Hist.*

And *Cauis*, who flouriſhed about 50 years after, ſays: "I have the trophies of the Apoſtles, which I "can ſhew. If you go the high way which leads to "the Vatican or by the way of Oſtia, you will find "fixed trophies by which, placed on each ſide, the Ro-"man Church is defended."—*Opur. Eus.*

Euſebius in his Chronicle on the year of Chriſt 71, ſays: *Nero* added to all his crimes a perſecution againſt the Chriſtians, in which *Peter* and *Paul* died glorioufly "at Rome."

Origenes in his third Book on *Geneſis*, as cited by *Euſebius*: "*Peter* remained to the laſt in Rome, and "was

" was crucified with his head downwards, which he " himself requested, least he should seem to be equalled " to his master."

Theodoret, in his letter to Pope *Leo*, says, " Rome " has the sepulchres of the common fathers and teach- " ers of truth, *Peter* and *Paul*."

Chrysostom, in his 32nd Homily on the Epistle to the Romans, says: " The Heavens are not more enlight- " ened, when the Sun emits its rays, than the city of " the Romans diffusing these two great lights all over " the world: hence *Paul* will be carried, hence *Peter*. " Think and tremble: what a sight will Rome behold! " *Paul* suddenly rising with *Peter*, and ascending to " meet our Lord."

Tertullien: " if you be near Italy, you have Rome. " Whence we have authority; a happy Church to " which the Apostles communicated the whole of their " doctrine with their blood; where *Peter* is equalled to " the passion of our Lord, and *Paul* is crowned by the " death of John. (B.)."—*Tert. de. Præ.*

Lactantius, an early and elegant writer, says: " Christ retiring opened to his disciples all future " events, which *Peter* and *Paul* preached at Rome " . . . . . when *Nero* had put them to death, *Vespa-* " *sian* extinguished both the name and the nation of " the Jews, and effected all these things which they " foretold would happen."—*Lact. div. Ins. Lib.* 4. *Cap.* 21.

St. *Ambrose*, Bishop of Milan, a man of strict veracity and great information, says, in his oration against *Auxentius*: " when *Peter* was going out of the city at " night, seeing Christ meet him in the gate, coming " in, he said: Lord whither dost thou go? to which " Christ replied, I am coming to Rome to be again " crucified. *Peter* understood the divine answer as re- " ferring to his cross . . . . . and being arrested he ho- " nored our Lord Jesus by his crucifixion."

St. *Jerome*, a man of the most consummate eruditi-

tion,

tion, and unqueſtionable veracity, thus ſays, in his book of illuſtrious men: *Simon Peter* goes to Rome to "ſubdue *Simon* the Magician, there he held the ſacer-"dotal chair twenty five years to the laſt, that is, to "the fourteenth of *Nero*, by whom he was fixed to a "croſs, crowned with martyrdom, his head towards "the earth."

St. *Auſtin:* "Rome commends the merits of *Peter* "and *Paul* in a more ſolemn manner, as they both "died the ſame day."—*Lib* 1. *de Con. Evan. Cap.* 10.

St. *Maximus* in his fifth ſermon on the feſtival of the Apoſtles ſays: "*Peter* and *Paul* ſuffered martyr-"dom in the city of Rome, which poſſeſſes the primacy "and ſupremacy, '*principatum & caput*,' of nations, "that where the chief ſeat of ſuperſtition had been, "there the chief ſeat of ſanctity might reſt."

Sulpitius, in his ſecond book of ſacred hiſtory, ſays: "divine religion encreaſed in the city, *Peter* in the "epiſcopal chair, '*Petro Epiſcopatum gerente*,' *Paul* "was ſoon after brought to the city . . . . . they were "both condemned, *Paul* beheaded with a ſword, and "*Peter* raiſed on a croſs."

Paul Oroſius: "*Nero* tormented and put the Chriſ-"tians to death in Rome, and endeavoured to extirpate "the very name, he ſlew the moſt holy Apoſtles of "Chriſt, *Peter* and *Paul*—*Peter* by the croſs, and *Paul* "by the ſword."—*Lib.* 7 *v. Hiſt.*

Eutropius:—in Vita Neronis, Lib. 7. "finally to "all his flagitious crimes he added this. He put the holy apoſtles *Peter* and *Paul* to death."

The teſtimonies of theſe early writers may be cloſed with that of *Euſebius:* "as *Nero* profeſſed himſelf an "open enemy to the deity and to piety, he firſt ſought "the death of the Apoſtles, as they were the leaders "and ſtandard bearers of the Chriſtian People; *Paul* "he beheaded in the city of Rome, *Peter* he condemn-"ned to be hanged on a croſs: to ſeek a teſtimony of "this event elſewhere is ſuperfluous: ſince the moſt ce-

"lebrated

" lebrated and ſplendid monuments atteſt the fact." *Hiſt. Lib. 2. Cap. 25.*

This celebrated writer thought it a moſt ſtupid thing to look for other proofs of a man's death whilſt his ſepulchre and other monuments were known to the whole city.

For the entire ſatisfaction of the Ex. the Writer begs leave to give him the teſtimony of three Proteſtant writers, not taken from theſe early times: they were not yet known.

Mr. *Whiſton*, in the memoirs of his own life, *p.* 599, writes thus: " Mr. *Bower*, with ſome weak " Proteſtants before him, almoſt pretends to deny that " St. *Peter* was at Rome, concerning which matter, " take my own former words out of my three tracts." *p.* 53.

Mr. *Baratier* proves moſt ſatisfactorily, as Doctor *Pearſon* had done before him, that *Peter* was at Rome; the former in his chronological enquiry of the ancient Biſhops of Rome, from *Peter* down to *Victor*, and the latter in a learned diſſertation now in his poſthumous works: " this, ſays he, is ſo clear in Chriſtian " antiquity that 'tis a ſhame for a Proteſtant to confeſs " that any Proteſtant ever denied it. This partial pro- " cedure demonſtrates that Mr. *Bower* has by no means " got clear of the prejudices of ſome Proteſtants as an " impartial writer of hiſtory, which he ſtrongly pre- " tends to be, ought to do; and he has in this caſe " greatly hurt the Proteſtant cauſe inſtead of ſerving it.

From the teſtimony of theſe Proteſtant divines who candidly acknowledge the inſincerity of *Bower*, the reader will ſee what credit is due to his hiſtory of the lives of Popes.

If ſuch a writer, who beetle like, feeds upon putrid ſores, were to give a hiſtory of the prophet *David*, he would have painted a monſter: he would have inſiſted on his perfidy to *Urias*, one of his moſt faithful officers; his inhuman treatment of the inhabitants of

Rabba,

Rabba, and all the cities of the children of Ammon, and thus expoſing, in ſtrong colouring, all the faults of this prince, and concealing all his virtues, paſſing unnoticed the penitential tears and mortifications by which he effaced his crimes, a *Bower*, or a *Muſgrave* would have taught an illiterate people to believe that this king, after God's own heart, was an impious and inhuman tyrant. Thus the ſimplicity of the uninformed is abuſed by theſe envenomed pens.

This ſhort digreſſion may ſerve as a corrective to that abuſe which the Ex. and his *learned Ally*, Mr. *C.* laviſh on Popes. They are the echoes of *Bower*, a weak and partial writer, as acknowledged by his friends, they might have added a malignant writer, who diſtorted every object, and painted it, not as it was in itſelf, but as it appeared, disfigured by malevolence in his own confuſed imagination.

That St. *Peter* not only died in Rome, where his ſepulchre is yet to be ſeen; but that he was Biſhop of that See is manifeſt from this ſimple reaſon;—that the Roman See was always conſidered as the firſt See in the world both by Greeks and Latins: no other reaſon can be aſſigned why 'twas thought the firſt and principal See, but becauſe 'twas founded by *Peter*. The ſame uncontradicted tradition and unanimous conſent of the Chriſtian world, which proves *Peter* to have been at Rome, ſhews alſo that he founded that See, and tranſmitted his official charge of feeding his Maſter's flock to his ſucceſſor in office.

St. *Ireneus* gives a catalogue of the Biſhops of Rome down to Pope *Elutherius*, his own cotemporary in the year 176. He begins with *Peter* and *Paul*, and ſays of *Clement*, that he was third from the Apoſtles.—*Lib. 3v. Cap. 3.*

To pretend that *Ireneus* did not know who was Biſhop of Rome in his own time, or who were his predeceſſors for ſo ſhort a ſpace as 176 years, is an inſult on the common ſenſe of mankind.

Tertullien

Tertultien, in his book of preſcriptions reaſoning againſt ſome ſectaries, ſays: "let them expoſe the or-"der of their Biſhops by their ſucceſſion, ſo that their "firſt Biſhop has been ſome one of the Apoſtles or "Apoſtolical men, as the Church of Rome numbers "*Clement* ordained by *Peter*."

St. *Cyprian* frequently calls the Roman See the chair of St. *Peter*: "they," ſaid he ſpeaking of ſome refractory characters, "dare to ſail to the chair of *Pe-*"*ter*, and to the principal church, from which ſacer-"dotal unity aroſe; and to carry letters from ſchiſm-"atics and profane men, not conſidering that they are "Romans, to whom perfidy can have no acceſs."

And in his letter to *Antonianus* he ſays: "*Cornelius* "was made Biſhop when the place of *Fabian*, that is, "when the place of *Peter* and the ſummit of the ſacer-"dotal chair was vacant."—*Lib.* 4. *Epiſt.* 2.

Euſebius in his Chronicles of the year 64. "*Peter* "by nation a Gallilean, the firſt pontiff of Chriſ-"tians when he had firſt founded the church of *Anti-*"*och* went to Rome, where preaching the Goſpel 25 "years he remained Biſhop of that city."

Thus the father of Church hiſtory, the moſt learned man of his age, and very little, if at all inferior to any man of any age, expreſsly ſays, that *Peter* was the firſt or ſupreme Pontiff of Chriſtians; that he remained 25 years Biſhop of Rome, and ſpeaks of it as a fact publicly and univerſally known.

Epiphanius, that celebrated writer, in his book of hereſies, ſpeaking of the hereſy of *Carpocates*, ſays: "in "Rome the ſucceſſion of Biſhops is thus, *Peter*, *Paul*, "*Linus*, *Cletus* . . . . . ."

He does not give the ſucceſſion of Biſhops in his own See, the Archiepiſcopal See of Salamina in Cyprus, nor of the Patriarchal See of Conſtantinople. 'Tis enough for a Catholic Prelate to ſhew that he's in communion with the See of Rome, and that the

 ſucceſſion

ſucceſſion in that See dates from *Peter* the Chief Paſtor of Chriſt's flock.

Athanaſius, in his letter to the *Aſcetics*, ſpeaking of the Arians, ſays: "they did not ſpare even *Liberius* "the Roman Biſhop, not moved with reverence that "that See is Apoſtolical."

Dorotheus in his Synopſis or ſhort view of the prophets and diſciples of Chriſt, ſays: "*Linus* was Bi- "ſhop of Rome after the great leader, "*Cerypheus*," "*Peter*." This laſt writer is not always correct: he is not cited by *Euſebius* or St. *Jerome*. But ſuch a public fact he could not miſtake.

Soyomen, the continuator of *Euſebius*' hiſtory, ſays: "'twas not without Divine Providence, that when "*Felix* died, *Liberius* alone preſided over the Church "of Rome, leaſt the See of *Peter* ſhould be aſperſed by "any ſtain of infamy."

This writer can't be ſuſpected of flattering the See of Rome, he was favourable to the Novatien ſectaries as appears from his works.

Optatus, in his ſecond book againſt *Parmenian*, ſays: "you can't deny that you know that in the city of "Rome the Epiſcopal chair was firſt conferred on "*Peter*."

In the ſame book he enumerates the Roman Biſhops from *Peter* down to *Siricius*, "at this day uni- ted," ſaid he, "in our fraternity, in which the whole "world agrees with us joined in one communion."

In the ſame work this able writer gives, as diſtinguiſhing marks of the Catholic Church, its unity, its ſanctity, and the chair of St. *Peter*, which, ſays he, "is "ours, and by this 'tis plain that we poſſeſs its other "prerogatives."

In the third book of this work he reaſons thus: "Chriſt ſaid to *Peter*: to thee will I give the keys of "the kingdom of heaven and the gates of hell ſhall "not prevail againſt it. Whence therefore do you "claim the keys, who with ſacrilegious preſumption

and

" and infolence fight againſt the chair of St. *Peter?*" preſſing his adverſary *Parmenian*, *Optatus* continues: " you can't deny that you know that the Epiſcopal " chair was firſt given to *Peter* in the city of Rome, on " which firſt ſat the head of the Apoſtles, *Peter*; " which chair was one, that all others might preſerve " unity by the union they had with it; and leaſt the " other Apoſtles might erect and defend chairs to " themſelves, ſo that he now is a ſchiſmatic and offen- " der, who ſets up another againſt the only chair."

He then deſcribes the origin and the allies of the Donatiſts. " as to your party, (ſays he) inquire after " the origin of your chair." The Donatiſts anſwered that they had alſo a Biſhop at Rome, by name *Macrobius*, ſucceſſor to *Euculpius*, who ſucceeded *Boniface* of Balli, and *Boniface* was ſucceſſor to a Victor *Garbienſis*, whom the Donatiſts had ſent from Africa to Rome, to preſide over their little ſeparate Church in that city. To this *Optatus* replies, " can *Macrobius* " ſay that he ſits in the chair of St. *Peter*, which per- " haps he never ſaw? for certainly he never went to " the ſepulchre of the Apoſtles, (that is, to officiate " publicly in the cathedral,) that he might be known " to the Catholic world, as poſſeſſed of the Apoſtolical " chair. He is diſobedient to the command of the " Apoſtle; who would have us communicate in the " memory of the ſaints: We ſee the relics of the two " Apoſtles, Sts. *Peter* and *Paul*, are in the Church at " Rome. Tell me, I pray, if he could offer in the " place, where theſe relics are kept? *Macrobius* your " brother muſt then confeſs that he is ſeated in the " chair of *Eucolpius*, *Boniface* of Balli, and Victor " *Garbienſis*. This Victor is a ſon without a father, a " diſciple without a maſter, a ſucceſſor without a pre- " deceſſor."

Whatever the Ex. or his Ally may think of the authority of *Optatus*, his reaſoning is irreſiſtible. *Parme-*

nian the Donatiſt, a man in every ſenſe ſuperior to this Ex. or his friend, found it ſo.

Optatus makes no inquiry about the ſucceſſion of Biſhops in the See of Carthage; nor did *Parmenian*, tho' he was the Donatiſt Biſhop of that See. 'Twas then ſo well aſcertained, ſo univerſally believed, that Rome was the Apoſtolical See, that all Sectaries, as well as Catholics acknowledged it.

It may not be amiſs to inform the Catholic reader that St. *Auſtin*, ſpeaking of *Optatus*, ranks him with St. *Cyprian* and *Hilary*; in another place he ſtyles him a Prelate of venerable memory, who was by his virtue an ornament to the Catholic Church.

St. *Fulgentius* ranks him with *Auſtin* and *Ambroſe*. He was Biſhop of Milevum, in Nunudia; an acute and powerful reaſoner—theſe are the men whom modern ſcribblers call *credulous men*. He muſt be unaccountably credulous who believes, that, whilſt we at the diſtance of fourteen or fifteen centuries know preciſely the Sees which were occupied by an *Auſtin*, an *Ambroſe*, an *Optatus*, and many others of inferior note. Theſe men ſo far ſuperior to us did not know the See which *Peter* occupied, or the prerogatives annexed to that See.

St. *Ambroſe*, in his third book on the Sacraments ſays: "*Peter* the Apoſtle, who was Prieſt of the Ro- "man Church, is to us author of this aſſertion."—*Cap.* 3.

St. *Auſtin*, in his ſecond book againſt *Pelilians* Letters, ſays: "What has the chair of the Roman Church "done to thee, in which *Peter* ſat, and in which now "*Anaſtaſius* ſits?"

Proſper, a diſciple of St. *Auſtin*, who continued the chronicle of *Euſebius* down to his own time in the year 445, in his book of ingratitude, ſays: "Rome "the ſeat of *Peter* of paſtoral honor, the head of the world . . . . . ."

Numberleſs citations from different authors are adduced

duced by polemical writers on this ſubject. Theſe few from the moſt celebrated authors, are adduced to convince the reader how little credit is due to *Bower*, or his echoes in ſlander, whilſt they preſume to contradict upon wild conjectures, the poſitive aſſertions of all writers of all countries from *Peter's* days down to the pretended reformation, in 1517.

Writers don't agree exactly on the time when *Peter* came to Rome. What then? Chronological writers ſeldom agree. Are we to conclude that a fact on which all agree, is not certain, becauſe at the diſtance of eighteen centuries we don't know preciſely the year on which it happened? this is not reaſoning, but cavilling.

The Ex. thinks *Paul's* ſilence with reſpect to *Peter* in his Epiſtle to the Romans, an argument that *Peter* was not there. What! does the ſilence of one man invalidate the poſitive teſtimony of many? perhaps *Peter* was not at Rome preciſely at that time: he made many excurſions in the courſe of his miſſion; if he had been at Rome St. *Paul* would not have mentioned him in a letter of inſtruction to the faithful: 'twould have been preſumption to addreſs ſuch a letter to *Peter*; he did not ſalute St. *John* at Epheſus, nor *Timothy* the Biſhop, as his letter was addreſſed to the faithful he did not claſs the Biſhop with them. He wrote letters of inſtruction to *Timothy* and *Titus*, who were his diſciples, but he never undertook to inſtruct his fellow Apoſtles, over whom he had no juriſdiction.

The Ex. concludes that if *Peter* was at Rome, he muſt have deſerted his original vocation. This our Ex. has not read the laſt chapter of St. *Matthew*, in which 'tis ſaid in very plain language that J. Chriſt ordered his Apoſtles to teach all nations. Was not *Peter* one of them? did *Peter* aſſert a falſehood when he told the Apoſtles at Jeruſalem, that they knew that God had made choice of him, that from his mouth the

Gentiles

Gentiles should hear the word and believe?—*Acts* xv. did *Paul* desert his original vocation when he preached to the Jews: "and immediately he preached Jesus in "the synagogue that he is the son of God?" *Acts* ix. 20. On his arrival at Rome were they not Jews to whom St. *Paul* preached? "And after the third day "he called together the chief of the Jews."—*tòn joudaiòn pròtous.*

How defenceless the cause must be; how destitute of solid reasons, in support of which even rest less imagination can hardly discover a shadow?

The Ex. descends at length from *Peter*. "If "says he, *p.* 75, *Peter* had been possessed of such high "authority it could not be so long concealed . . . . . "it must have been engrafted in Christianity." The last proposition is true; and because 'twas engrafted in Christianity 'twas universally known to all Catholics, sectaries, and even to heathens: of this sufficient proof has been already adduced: 'twas manifestly revealed in the New Testament which was in the hands of Christian sectaries, and such heathens as could procure a copy.

That this authority was vested in the Bishop of Rome, *Peter's* lawful successor, is manifest from the very nature of things: an official authority must pass to the successor in office.

Authority is given to the pastor, not for himself, but for the flock over which he is placed, it must therefore continue as long as the flock continues; the flock of Christ will continue to the end of time, the authority of Chief Pastor vested in *Peter* by the express words of Christ, must also continue in his successors till the end of time.

That the Bishop of Rome was *Peter's* successor, was known to the faithful then at Rome, by the testimony of their senses, as all such facts are known; 'twas known to all other churches by authentic letters, as neighbouring nations know when one Prince succeeds another;

another; to us 'tis known by that universal and uninterrupted tradition by which we know the scriptures to be the word of God; hence all these writers already cited, and many others, passed unnoticed to avoid prolixity speak of it as a public fact known to the world, of which no man doubted.

"The Eastern Churches of Constantinople, Antioch, "Jerusalem, and Asia Minor, never heard of such an "authority, says the Ex. *p.* 76, and when 'twas claim-"ed, they treated it as a pretension totally unfounded, "and never submitted to it." What never! the Ex. dreams: that all the Asiatic Churches did submit to the authority of the Roman See, from *Gregory's* days in the year 590 down to *Photius'* schism in 866, no Protestant, who had any remains of modesty, ever denied; 'tis strange that so many Patriarchs and Prelates should for some centuries tamely submit to an authority of which their ancestors knew nothing. By what contrivance were these clearsighted Greeks imposed upon, and taught to believe that a superior authority did exist, of which their Ancestors were ignorant?

"It was declared by the Council of Nice, (says the "Ex. *p.* 76,) that the Patriarchs of Alexandria and "Antioch, had the same authority over the coun-"tries round them, that he of Rome had over those "which lay about that city." The Ex. most injudiciously cites this Council of Nice. Why not tell his readers that of the 318 Prelates who composed that venerable assembly, there was not one protestant; that to a man they believed in transubstantiation and celebrated mass most piously, as we Papists do yet. The Ex. does not cite the canon but gives a spurious version of it in order to mislead the unlearned, the writer must beg leave to correct both the Ex's. version and interpretation. 'Tis the 6th of Nice, to which he alludes the canon is thus conceived: "Let the ancient custom "continue in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, that the "Bishop of Alexandria have the power of all these."

The

The Council immediately assigns the motive on which this disposition was founded in favour of the Bishop of Alexandria, "because this is the custom of the Bishop "of Rome, *oti kai tō in té Rómé Epiſcopo touto ſune-* "*thes eſti.*" Which words of the Council, whatever efforts are made to distort them from their natural and intended signification, can bear no other sense but this, because 'twas the custom of the Bishop of Rome to invest the Bishop of Alexandria with a jurisdiction over them provinces. And in fact no other reason can be assigned, for the Bishop of Alexandria was not invested by J. Christ with any jurisdiction over the Bishops in them provinces; nor could he assume it by his own private authority, nor did the Council invest him with this authority which had existed long before the Council was assembled: the Council only decided that the old custom should continue, in order to prevent disputes.

How unlucky is this Ex. in his reference to authorities; they invariably condemn him.

This Council of Nice was held in the year 325; the Prelates say 'twas an old custom for the Bishop of Alexandria to superintend several provinces, and they ascribe the source of this authority to the custom adopted by the Bishop of Rome. The commencement of this canon of the Council of Nice does not appear in printed books; but 'tis given by a Council of equal authority, that of Chalcedon, in 451. 'Tis thus cited in the 16th Action by the Bishop *Paſchaſius*: "the "Roman Church had always ths primacy. Let the "old custom continue that the Bishop of Alexandria, "&c." After this 6th canon of the Council of Nice was read, the judges said: "We consider that all pri- "macy and chief honor according to the canons be re- "served to the beloved of God, the Archbishop of old "Rome."

The oriental Prelates assembled at Constantinople in 382, who were present at the second General Council

in

in 381, in a letter addreſſed to Pope *Damaſcus*, and the Weſtern Prelates then at Rome, ſay in excuſe, for not coming to Rome; " ſome of us cannot poſſibly " do it, becauſe we prepared ourſelves to travel not " farther than Conſtantinople, as we were commanded " by letters ſent by your Reverence to the Emperor " *Theodoſius*. The laſt year after the Council of " *Aquileia*. . . . . " In the ſame letter they thank him for calling them as his own members, " *èmas ós oikeia melè proſkaleſaſthe*. *Tom.* 2. *Com. p.* 962. *C. D.* In his letter to them Prelates *Damaſus* twice calls them his moſt honoured Children. " *vioi timiſa-* " *tatoi*," *ibid.* would theſe Prelates ſay, they were commanded by the Pope, if they acknowledged no authority in him? would they make an excuſe to a Prelate poſſeſſed of no juriſdiction? the ſuppoſition is abſurd.

The whole of this letter is given by *Theodoret*, and is now before the writer. *Lib.* 5. *Cap.* 9.

Evagrius the Syrian, whom *Photius*, a good judge of hiſtory, tho' a very bad man, thinks an accurate hiſtorian, ſays in his hiſtory, *Lib.* 1. *Hiſt. Cap.* 4. that the general council of Epheſus, depoſed *Neſtorius* Patriarch of Conſtantinople, by a mandate from the Roman Pontiff; but thinking the cauſe of *John*, Patriarch of Antioch more doubtful, did not preſume to pronounce on it, but reſerved it for the judgment of Pope *Caleſtine* himſelf.

The Council of Chalcedon held in the year 451, in the 1ſt, 2d, and 3d actions, frequently calls *Leo*, then Pope, Pontiff of the univerſal Church; and in their report to him of the tranſactions in the Council they ſay, " if where two or three are aſſembled in his name " Chriſt has promiſed to be there in the midſt of them, " how much more eſpecially was he with five hundred " and twenty Biſhops . . . . . when you conduct as the " *Head* conducts the members :" " *ei gar òpou eiſi* " *duò ê treis ſunêgmenoi eis tou auto uonoma ekeiephè*

" *einai en meſo auton. Poſen peri pentakoſious eikoſta* " *ſereas tèn oikeiáſin epedeik neuto . . . . . on ſu men* " *os kephalé melon ègemoneuen en tois ten ſen taain epo-* " *chouſi tên eunoian epideik numenos. In relatione ad* " *Papam.*"

Speaking of *Dioſcorus*, the wicked Patriarch of Alexandria, whom they had depoſed, after enumerating other crimes, the Prelates ſay: " moreover he exten- " ded his madneſs againſt him, who was by the " Saviour entruſted with the care of the Vineyard, " that is againſt your Holineſs:" " *eti kai kat autou* " *tou tes Ampelou ton phulaken para tou ſoteroros epite-* " *pommenou ten mani an exeteine; legomen de tes ſes* " *oſiotetos.*"

In the General Council of Epheſus held in the year 431, 'twas affirmed without a contradiction, or even without the leaſt emotion of ſurpriſe, that P*eter* was the head of the Apoſtles, and Pope *Celeſtine*, (then at " Rome), head of the Council. " P*etros ô exarchos kai* " *kephale kai kephale ton apoſtolon.*"—*anaginoſkomenon* " *ainon ton grammaton tou à gia kephale tais agiais ek-* "*boeſin enenochate.*"—*Tom. 3. Act 3. p. 625, A. B.*

In the ſeventh ſynod held at Nice, which P*hotius*, though not a Proteſtant, an irreconcileable enemy to the Papal power, ranks amongſt General Councils. Pope *Adrian's* letter to *Tharaſius* was received with univerſal applauſe, in it we read that his See was head of the univerſal Church: " *te emetro apoſtolico throno* " *oſtis eſti kephale paſon ton ekkleiſon;*"—*Epiſt. ad Tha. Tom. 7. Con. p. 125. D. E.* That it has a diſtinguiſhed primacy over the inhabited world; that P*eter* always was and is ſtill ſupreme: " *Su ei Petros* " *. . . . . ou o thronos eis paſan ten oikomenen pro-* " *teuon dialampei, kai kephale paſon ton ekkleſion upar-* " *chei . . . . . to tou kuriou proſtagmati poimanon ten* " *ekkleſsian . . . . . ekrateſepantote kai kratei ten ar-* " *chen.*"—*ibid.*

The teſtimony of General Councils celebrated by the

the Latins is omitted, though in them we have ſome thouſands of reſpectable witneſſes; againſt the Greeks and Aſiatics no objection can lie, of theſe we have 520 Prelates ſubſcribing witneſſes in the Council of Chalcedon, 318 in the Council of Nice, ſome hundreds in that of Conſtantinople and of Epheſus; yet in the face of ſo many witneſſes, Greeks, and Aſiatics, Patriarchs and Prelates, the Ex. aſſerts that theſe Greeks and Aſiatics knew nothing of the Biſhop of Rome's pre-eminence! he muſt have ſcrupulouſly adhered to Doctor *Banniſter's* rule, that is to read the heathen poets and philoſophers, then paſs all the writers of fifteen centuries unnoticed, till that great light of Saxony, *Martin Luther*, appeared, and with the aſſiſtance of the century writers of Magdeburg, new-modelled the hiſtory of the Church as well as its faith.

'Tis ſomething remarkable that the firſt four General Councils of Nice, of Conſtantinople, of Epheſus, and Chalcedon, are acknowledged genuine, and declared authentic, by the eſtabliſhed Church of England in her thirty-nine Articles. The framers of the Articles did not read the acts and deciſions of them Councils. Or if they did, they did not think it prudent to reject an authority, which the Chriſtian world had revered for ſo many centuries. Be that as it will, the writer begs leave to aſſure the Ex. and his friends, that the Acts of theſe Councils are yet extant in the hands of Greeks as well as Latins, who cannot be preſumed in concert to have ſuppoſed or interpolated them. He has to lament that he cannot refer the Ex. to Oxford, as *Cromwell's* reforming ſoldiers in their great zeal for the deſtruction of Popery, had committed to the flames in one morning, forty thouſand volumes, the monuments of antiquity, which that Univerſity in the days of Popery, had with perſevering diligence and a vaſt expence, collected from all parts of the world; and the few volumes which had eſcaped the paws of *Henry* the VIIIth's ravaging and reforming monaſterial viſitors,

collected by *Cotton*, were consumed by an accidental fire in 1731.

These soldiers were judicious reformers: they knew that Popery was so interwoven with antiquity, that the one could not be destroyed till all the monuments of the other were effaced.

That the Popes in the first ages of Christianity did exercise their jurisdiction, and that the Greeks and Asiatics did submit to it, besides the testimony of these Councils already adduced, we have the testimony of all early writers on the subject of Church History.

St. *Ignatius*, a disciple of St. *Peter*, in his Epistle to the Romans marks the pre-eminence of that See: his letter is thus addressed: "To the beloved Church, "which is enlightened by the will of him, who or-"daineth all things, which are according to the cha-"rity of J. Christ our God, which *presides* in the "country of the Romans worthy of God, most adorn-"ed, justly happy, most commended, fitly regulated, "and governed, most chaste and *presiding in charity*."

To the other Churches his letters are addressed in a different manner: thus, "to the blessed Church "which is at Ephesus—*te ous a en Epheso*," at Tralles: at Magnesias, near the Meander: at Philadelphia: at Smyrna.

St. *Ireneus: Lib* 3. *Cap.* 3. "We confound all "those, who in whatever manner, whether through "self-love, vain glory, blindness or unsound doctrine, "collect what they ought not, by indicating to them "the faith of the greatest, the most ancient, and best "known Church founded at Rome by the two most "glorious Apostles *Peter* and *Paul*; and that tradition, "which it has from them and is come to us by the "succession of Bishops. 'Tis necessary that every "Church should agree with this on account of its more "powerful principality. That is the faithful, who are "in all places, in which Church the tradition, which "is from the Apostles, is always preserved by those

"who

" who are every where faithful." No modern Papiſt ſpeaks in ſtronger terms than this learned Greek of the ſecond century.

Epiphanius ſays: " that *Urſace* and *Valens* went in " penance with libels (ſupplicatory) to the bleſſed *Ju-* " *lius*, Biſhop of Rome, to give an account of their er- " ror and their crime." *Her.* 68.

Would theſe Biſhops appear to account for their conduct before a Biſhop in whom they acknowledge no juriſdiction?

St. *Athanaſius* atteſts in his ſecond apology, that theſe Biſhops did aſk pardon of Pope *Julius* for their crime; and in his letter to Pope *Felix*, this patriarch of Alexandria ſays: " for this that Jeſus Chriſt placed " you and your predeceſſors in the fortreſs of the ſum- " mit, and ordered you to take care of all Churches. " that you might aſſiſt us . . . . . "

In his book on the opinions of *Dennis*, patriarch of Alexandria, he ſays: " that ſome went up to Rome and " accuſed the patriarch before *Dennis* the Roman Pre- " late." Did they pretend to accuſe him before a man, who had no juriſdiction over him?

Baſil the Great, in his 52nd letter to *Athanaſius*, ſays: " it appears meet to write to the Biſhop of " Rome, that he may ſee our affairs, and interpoſe " the ſentence of his judgment; and becauſe, 'tis diffi- " cult for any to be ſent, thence by order of the Coun- " cil, let him give authority to ſome choſen perſons, " who may be able to ſupport the fatigues of the " journey; and who by friendly and eaſy manners, as " well as by well adapted and prudent words, may " adminiſh thoſe, who have declined from the right " way, and bring with them alſo, the acts of the " Council of Rimini, to reſcind what has been done, " violently there." This Greek Prelate, as well from his ſcience as his ſanctity, ſurnamed *the Great*, knew that the Pope had a power of nominating viſitors for the Eaſtern Churches, and power reſcinding the

Acts

Acts of a numerous Council, on proof of violence offered to the members who compoſed it. And yet our Ex. confidently aſſerts, that the Greeks and Aſiatics knew no ſuch juriſdiction! does he know better than the Greek Prelates themſelves?

Chryſoſtom, Patriarch of Conſtantinople, in the year 407, had been unjuſtly depoſed by *Theophylus* Patriarch, of Alexandria in an aſſembly compoſed of ſome of his own creatures, and under the protection of the Empreſs *Eudoxia*, a woman of whom *Zozymus*, a heathen writer, ſays: *Op. Tom. 3. v. p.* 515. "that "her avarice, extortion, and injuſtice, knew no "bounds; that to gratify theſe paſſions ſhe had filled "the Court with informers, Harpys and Calumniators." *Chryſoſtom*, in conſequence wrote to the Pope *Innocent* the firſt, in theſe terms; "I beſeech you to "write theſe Acts ſo unjuſtly paſſed, have no force, "and that they who have acted ſo unjuſtly, may be "ſubject to the penalty of Eccleſiaſtical Laws."

In his ſecond letter to Pope *Innocent*, he ſays: "we return you perpetual thanks, becauſe you have "declared your paternal benevolence to us." In the ſame letter he prays the Pontiff not to launch an excommunication againſt *Theophylus*, and his adherents tho' they deſerve it: "I pray your vigilance, ſays "he, that tho' they have filled all places with tumults, "if they be deſirous of being healed of the diſeaſe, "they be not afflicted, nor rejected out of the Communion." Here we have a Patriarch of Conſtantinople, the moſt celebrated Prelate that ever filled that See, appealing to the Roman Pontiff, againſt the oppreſſion of an Aſiatic Council protected by the Empreſs, and by a juridicial Act acknowledging the juriſdiction of the Roman See, over all the Greek and Aſiatic Churches.

Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, in his 10th Epiſtle to *Neſtorius*, then Patriarch of Conſtantinople, and in his 11th Epiſtle to the Clergy and People of Conſtantinople,

tinople, says: "that if *Nestorius* within the time pre-
"scribed by the Pope *Celestine*, did not revoke his
"errrors, he is excommunicated." And in his 18th letter to Pope *Celestine*, whom he calls most *Holy Father*, he asks if it be his will that the people may as yet hold Communion with *Nestorius*, or avoid him.

The great *Theodoret*, Bishop of Cyrus, when unjustly deposed by *Dioscirus* and his gang, in the infamous Assembly, at Ephesus, appealed to the Roman See, and by its authority was reinstated. In his letter to Pope *Leo*, he says: "I wait the sentence of your "apostolical See. I supplicate, and beseech your Ho-"lineſs to give relief to me; who appeal to your just, "and equitable judgment; and that, you order me to "appear before you, and expose my doctrine, follow-"ing the steps of the Apostles."

In his letter to *Renatus* Priest of the Roman Church, he says: "they spoiled me of the Priesthood, they ex-"pelled me from the cities, without any respect to my "age, passed in religion, or my grey hairs, where-"fore, I pray you that you persuade the most holy, "Archbishop *Leo*, to use his apostolical authority, "and order us to come to your Council: for that holy "See holds the Government, of all the Churches in "the World."

Soyomen, the Greek historian says: *Lib. 3. Cap. 7.* that *Julius*, Bishop of Rome, reinstated *Athanasius* in the See of Alexandria, and *Paul* in that of Constantinople: "since says the historian, on account of the "dignity of his See, the care of all others belongs to "him, he restored to each of them their Churches." Hence we see that his jurisdiction was known, acknowledged and exercised over all the Greek, and Asiatic Churches, which our Ex. thought ignorant of it.

Pope *Victor*, in the year 192, threatened to excommunicate the Asiatics for celebrating the Easter on the same day, with the Jews: "*Blastus*," says *Tertullien*,

de

de præ in fine.—" fraudulently endeavoured to intro-
" duce Judaiſm: he ſaid that Eaſter was not to be ce-
" lebrated but according to the law of *Moſes*, on the
" fourteenth day of the month." As the Aſiatics had adopted this mode of celebrating the Eaſter, the Pontiff applying an effectual remedy to a growing evil, either did or ſeriouſly threatened to retrench from the Catholic communion all thoſe who obſtinately perſiſted in the error. *Euſebius* relates the fact *Hiſt. Lib.* 5. *Cap.* 24. He adds that St. *Ireneus* and other Prelates made ſtrong remonſtrances to the Pope: " their let-
" ters, (ſays *Euſebius*) are exant, in which they ſharply
" reprove *Victor* as acting contrary to the intereſts of
" the Church." The letters of theſe Prelates ſhew that they thought this act of authority, on the validity of which they formed no doubt, both inexpedient and ill-timed. *Irenæus* had been ſent in the year 177 as deputy from the Church of Lyons to *Eleutherius*, *Victor's* immediate predeceſſor, to pray him not to cut off the orientals for what he and other Prelates thought a trifling difference in diſcipline; *Victor*, better informed, ſaw that 'twas not ſimply a difference in diſcipline, but a gradual introduction of Judaiſm. And whether he did in fact excommunicate the Aſiatics, or in complaiſance to theſe Prelates confine himſelf to threats. His ſeverity put a ſtop to the progreſs of the evil, his authority was never called in queſtion.

That Popes have in all ages claimed this pre-eminence, no man doubts who has any knowledge of Church hiſtory. *Julius* the Firſt, famed for ſcience and ſanctity, in his letter to the Orientals, which *Athanaſius*, a credible witneſs, gives entire in his ſecond apology ſays to them, " Don't you know it
" to be the cuſtom firſt to write to us, that here what
" is juſt may be determined? wherefore if ſuch a
" ſuſpicion be conceived againſt a Biſhop, 'twas neceſ-
" ſary to repeat it here to our Church ....." And underneath he ſays, " what we have received from

the

" the bleſſed Apoſtle *Peter* we ſignify to you, though " we ſhould not have written, what we think you al- " ready know, if the facts had not diſturbed us. *Ju-* " *lius* claimed a right and exerciſed that right of jud- ging the Patriarchs. This we know from themſelves, tho' Ex. thinks they knew no ſuch right.

Pope *Damaſus* in his letter to the oriental Prelates, which *Theodoret* gives in his hiſtory, *Lib.* 5. *Cap.* 10. ſays: " Whereas your charity moſt honored ſons gives " due reverence to the Apoſtolic See, you thereby do " honor to yourſelves: for though we hold the princi- " pal place in the Church, where the Apoſtle ſitting " has taught us to ſteer; we notwithſtanding acknow- " ledge ourſelves unfit for ſuch a dignity."

That the great *Theodoret* did not think the Pope aſ- ſuming in ſaying that he held the principal place in the Church, we know: for immediately before the inſertion of this letter he ſays: " the celebrated *Da-* " *maſus*, a man worthy of eternal praiſe, as ſoon as he " heard that this hereſy began to ſpread, did not only " depoſe and excommunicate *Apollinaris*, but alſo *Ti-* " *mothy* his diſciple, and gave notice to the Biſhops of " the Eaſt by letters, which letters I have thought ne- " ceſſary to inſert in this hiſtory."

Apollinaris was Biſhop of Laodicea, in Syria, and his diſciples choſe one of their party, *Timothy*, to fill the patriarchal See of Alexandria; they were both depo- ſed and excommunicated by Pope *Damaſus*. This we know from the oriental writers.

Innocent the Iſt. in his letter to the Council of Mi- levis, which is the 93d amongſt St. *Auſtin's* Epiſtles, ſays: " You diligently and meetly attend to the Apo- " ſtolical honor; to the honor of him, on whom be- " ſides theſe things which are without, the care of all " Churches is incumbent: you obſerve the form of the " ancient rule—which you know has been obſerved by the whole world with us.

And in his Epiſtle to the Council of Carthage, the

91ſt amongſt St. *Auſtin*'s, he ſays: " that the Roman " See is the fountain and head of all other churches."

The century writers pretend that St. *Innocent* aſſumed too much. Men who do not ſpare *Peter* 'tis not ſurpriſing that they ſhould cenſure his ſucceſſors; but St. *Auſtin*, an African Prelate, indiſputably the moſt learned man of his age, ſays of theſe letters of *Innocent*, in his Epiſtle to *Paulinus* the 106th: " He anſwered " us on all theſe tranſactions in ſuch a manner as be- " came the Prelate of the Apoſtolical See." Were the century writers better informed of the rights and privileges of the African Church than St. *Auſtin?*

The writer paſſes unnoticed paſſages which are adduced from the firſt Epiſtle of *Clement*, the third of *Anacletus*, the firſt of *Alexander*, of *Pius*, of *Anicetus*, of *Victor*, of *Zephyrinus*, the ſecond, of *Calictus*, the firſt, of *Lucius*, of *Melchiades*, and of *Marius*. He alſo paſſes in ſilence the letters of *Leo* the Great, of *Gregory* and all ſucceeding Pontiffs; he has confined himſelf to theſe teſtimonies, which are warranted by cotemporary writers of greateſt note. Againſt which no objection can be ſtated which is not offenſive to common ſenſe.

The Ex. has recourſe to St. *Cyprian's* authority, in order to eſtabliſh his pretended equality of Biſhops. He could not have been more unlucky in his choice: they are not detached ſentences from the works of that celebrated writer, which are adduced in ſupport of Catholic doctrine; but whole books profeſſedly written to demonſtrate the unity of the Church, and the unity of the prieſthood deſcending from St. *Peter:* In his book on the unity of the Church, after having ſhewn by the moſt concluſive reaſoning, that the Church is eſſentially *one*. He ſays, " that as a vi- " ſible mark of this unity, Chriſt built his Church " upon St. *Peter*, and gave the power of his keys to " him, though he alſo gave power to all his Apoſtles " he would have it take its riſe from one, and ſettled " the

" the whole upon that fouudation . . . . . " He lays down as a general rule in matters of faith, that, fact is to be aſſumed as proof; he then produces as a well-known fact the Church founded by J. Chriſt upon St. *Peter*, from whence its unity is manifeſt; from this known principle he infers that the man, who deſerts this Church is unſanctified, an alien, an enemy; he cannot have God for his father, who hath not the Church for his mother: " who, (ſays he,) is ſo profli-" gate and abandoned as to imagine that the unity " which ſubſiſts in heaven may be broken on earth? " that the Church of Chriſt, which is always deſcribed " as one, may be devided into many? to believe that " this is poſſible is groſs abſurdity; and to attempt it is " flagrant impiety, our Lord, (ſays he,) tells us there " ſhall be one fold and one ſhepherd."

In his diſpute with Pope *Stephen*, on the baptiſm of ſectaries, an abſtruſe and difficult queſtion, which was not at that time ultimately determined by an expreſs declaration of the Church, St. *Cyprian* menaced by the Pope for adhering to what the Pope knew to be erroneous, though St. *Cyprian* thought it a matter of meer diſcipline, dropped ſome unguarded expreſſions againſt his ſuperior, but never called his authority in queſtion.

St. *Cyprian* did not believe the Pope infallible, nor do many Catholics to this day. That is meer matter of opinion; he thought his own opinion of the invalidity of baptiſm without the pale of the Church founded on the Scriptures; and to conſult the Scriptures alone without having recourſe to tradition, which determines the intended ſenſe of the Scriptures, he was not wrong. That tradition was not then expreſsly declared by the Church. If it had been from the principles which St. *Cyprian* lays down in his book of the Church and other works, we are authoriſed to ſay that he would have ſubmitted to it—hence St. *Auſtin*, his countryman and great admirer, ſays of him, quoting

theſe words of *Cyprian* in a Council which he had aſſembled at Carthage, and to which the Ex'rs. learned author, as he calls him, ſeems to allude: "ſince there "is none of us who has conſtituted himſelf Biſhop "of Biſhops, or by tyrannical terror obliges his col- "leagues to obedience ſince each Biſhop has the free "diſpoſal of his own power for the liberty of his opi- "nion not to be judged by any other, but we all expect "the judgment of J. Chriſt, who has the power of pre- "poſing us in the government of his Church, and "judging us for our actions." "I believe, (ſaid St. "*Auſtin*,) *Lib.* 3. *de Bap. Cap.* 3. in theſe queſtions, "which have not yet been clearly diſcuſſed.—Thus St. *Auſtin* explains St. *Cyprian's* opinion.

'Tis not neceſſary to inform the reader that St. *Cyprian* ſpoke of the Biſhops then aſſembled at Carthage, of whom certainly none was Biſhop of Biſhops, whom he himſelf as primate of Numidia, and preſident of the Aſſembly, invited to give their thoughts freely on what he believed meer matter of opinion or diſcipline, on which, before any public deciſion of the Church every man had a right to ſpeak his ſentiments. 'Tis true he alludes to St. *Stephen's* threats, which he conſiders as tyrannical, and depriving Biſhops of the liberty of opinion in a queſtion not yet decided; but that he never denied the authority of the Roman See in matters of faith and univerſal diſcipline, is manifeſt to demonſtration from different parts of his works: his book on the unity of the Church is expreſsly written on that ſubject, in it he ſtates the Roman See as the root, and all other ſubordinate Churches as the Branches.—The branches are evidently dependent on the root.

In his letter to *Cornelius*, then Pope, he ſays:— "Sects and ſchiſms reſult from this only, that obedience "is not paid to the prieſt of God; nor is it conſidered "that there is but one prieſt of God for the time, and "one judge for the time in the place of Chriſt, to "whom, if according to divine inſtruction, the whole

"fraternity

" fraternity obeyed, no one would disturb the college " of priests."—*Lib.* i. *Epis.* 3.

St. *Cyprian* shews that there is but one Priest in the Catholic Church to whom all others owe obedience; that disobedience to him is the source of heresy and schism. This is the writer whom the Ex. quotes for the equality of Bishops! in the same Epistle he calls the Roman Church the See of St. *Peter*, and the principal Church from which the unity of the priesthood arises.

In a second Epistle to the same Pope, he says of the ill-fated men, who were engaged in the schism of *Novatien*,—" We lately sent our colleagues that they " might compose to the unity of the Catholic Church " these members of the rent body; but the obstinate " and inflexible perverseness of the adverse party has " not only refused the embrace of the root and mo- " ther, but also has formed to itself an adulterous and " opposite head without the pale of the Church."—*Lib.* 2. *Epis.* 10.

Novatien himself, the Antipope, St. *Cyprian* calls: " a deserter of the Church, an enemy to all tenderness, " an absolute murderer of penance, a teacher of pride, " a corrupter of truth, a destroyer of charity." What would he have said of the Saxon Antipope, who not only abolished penance, but raised Epicurean sensuality on its ruins?

In a letter to the people, he says: " there is one " God, one Christ, one Church, one chair founded " by the voice of the Lord on *Peter*, another altar, a " new priesthood besides that one altar, and that one " priesthood cannot be erected. He that gathers else- " where scatters."—*Lib.* 1. *Ep.* 8.

Finally, as a direct contradiction to this Ex. and his learned author, St. *Cyprian*, in his letter to St. *Stephen*, which is still extant in his third book, 13th Epistle, exhorts the Pope to order the then Bishop of Arles, *Marcian*, to be deposed, and a successor provided for that

that See. "Inform us, (continues St. *Cyrian*,) if you "pleaſe, who is made Biſhop of Arles in place of "*Marcian*, that we may know to whom we are to "ſend letters of communion, and direct our brethren."

It may not be amiſs to inform the Catholic reader that though St. *Stephen* threatened to excommunicate both St. *Cyprian* and St. *Firmilian* the learned Biſhop of *Ceſarea* and other Prelates, who thought the baptiſm of ſectaries invalid, he did not put the threat in execution: of this we have the teſtimonies of *Euſebius* and St. *Auſtin*. The former ſays, *Lib.* 7. *Cap.* 5. that St. *Dyoniſius* of Alexandria interceded and obtained a reſpite; and St. *Auſtin* ſays: "*Stephen* thought "of excommunicating them . . . . . but being endu"ed with the bowels of holy charity he judged it bet"ter to abide in union . . . . . the peace of Chriſt "was victorious in their hearts."

The Ex. ſays, *p.* 75, that the high authority of the See of Rome was totally unknown for many centuries after Chriſt; and *p.* 77, he tells us that St. *Irænus* and other Prelates early expreſſed their reſentment and cenſure againſt theſe encroachments—did they expreſs their reſentment againſt a thing that was totally unknown? St. *Irænus* is a writer of the ſecond century: he ſeverely cenſured what he thought an inexpedient and ill-timed exerciſe of Pope *Victor's* juriſdiction, who ſeriouſly threatened, if he did not actually excommunicate the oriental Biſhops for celebrating Eaſter on the ſame day with the Jews; but no man was more ſubmiſſive to that very authority, the abuſe of which he cenſured than *Irænus* himſelf.

How this Ex. has diſcovered the ignorance of theſe early times is not eaſy to ſurmiſe: he does not ſeem to have read a line of the works of theſe celebrated writers, whom the Chriſtian world revered. Does he intend to perſuade us that theſe men who were threatened with an excommunication knew nothing of the Pope's authority?

The

The Ex. ſtates the immoral lives of ſome Popes as an objection to their juriſdiction. This objection deſerves no anſwer: the heathens knew that the powers of public men did not depend on their perſonal qualities: virtue adorns the man, and vice diſfigures him, but neither the one nor the other gives the powers of office or deſtroys them.

In his abuſe of Popes he agrees with his ally—that's a favourite theme. This eminent writer from whom they borrow, is in all appearance the infamouſly famous retailer of ſlander, *Bower*, or *Aretin* of impudent memory. If the Ex. or his aſſociate had ſtudied ethics, they would have known that the man, who in order to defame, confidently advances that for truth, which he does not know to be truth, is a calumniator, a term which is in a particular manner applied to the enemy of man. All vague aſſertions only expoſe the malevolence of the writer; they require no refutation.

The Ex. under pretence of inſtructing Mr. B. betrays the moſt profound ignorance of hiſtory. Mr. B. did not want to be informed that the Popes were elected by the Clergy with the conſent and approbation of the people, and in latter times with the conſent of the Emperor before the inſtitution of Cardinals; but the writer informs this Ex. that the General Aſſembly at Rome were heathens for near 300 years after the death of Chriſt; that during that period neither the nobility nor burgeſſes had any thing to do with the elections of Popes: they were elected by the Clergy and the Biſhops of the adjacent Sees, as were all Catholic Biſhops during that interval. He alſo begs leave to inform this Ex. that ſpiritual powers are not conferred by meer election, which only deſignates the perſon thought the beſt qualified for the office by the electors: but by the external ceremony of inauguration and conſecration inſtituted by J. Chriſt, from whom all ſpiritual powers are derived.

This Ex. who believes nothing but what is expreſ-

ſly

ſly declared in Scripture, will find no ſuch right as that of appointing their ſpiritual Paſtors given to laymen: in the Old Teſtament, *Moſes*, who was himſelf a prieſt, by the expreſs order of God anointed *Aaron* and his ſon *Eleaſar* after him without conſulting the people; and during the Jewiſh diſpenſation the prieſthood was excluſively confined to the family of *Aaron*. The prince and people ſometimes removed one of that family from his office and ſubſtituted another of the ſame family; but they never pretended to conſecrate the prieſt, or confer on him the powers which were excluſively confined to the prieſtly office: in the new law J. Chriſt himſelf in perſon choſe his Apoſtles, conferred on them their ſpiritual powers, and ſent them in the ſame manner to inſtitute other miniſters of his church: "as the father ſent me ſo I ſend you."—*John* xxi. That is, as the father ſent me to preach and teach and to appoint others, ſo I alſo ſend you to preach and teach and appoint others in the ſame manner. Thus the Apoſtles underſtood him,—hence we find them inſtituting miniſters in the different churches, which they founded, and authorizing Paſtors without conſulting the people.—*Acts* xiv. 25. *Kemonitius* and his aſſociates pretend that the participle *Cheirotonéſantes* ſignifies to elect by holding up hands; if ſo the Apoſtles elected the miniſters by holding up their own hands; becauſe *Cheirotoneſantes* is ſaid of *Paul* and *Barnaby*, not of the people. To paſs unnoticed the arrogance of a ſmatterer in Greek, who, becauſe with the aſſiſtance of his Grammar and Lexicon he makes a ſhift to tranſlate a few lines of *Anacreon* or *Euripides*, thinks he knows the force of the Greek terms better than a *Chryſoſtom*, a Greek author whoſe ſtyle is compared to that of *Plato*, by ſome judges. St. *Chryſoſtom* in his 14th Homily explaining the Acts of the Apoſtles, on his text ſays: "*touto eſti Cheirotonia*" *That is ordination.* And in his 10th Homily on the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* he aſks why the Apoſtle after having

ving enumerated the qualifications of a Biſhop, paſſes immediately to the Deacon? to which he replies, that the qualifications of the Biſhop and the Prieſt are ſimilar, as the Biſhop ſurpaſſes the Prieſt but by the power of ordination: *ten gar Cheirotoneian monen "anabekekaſi."*

The Council of Nice compoſed of Greek and Aſiatic Prelates, makes uſe of the ſame term *Cheirotoneia* to ſignify ordination in their letter to the Chuch of Alexandria, which *Theodoret*, a Greek writer of note, gives in hiſtory. *Lib.* 1. *v. Cap.* 9. The Prelates ſay of *Meletius*, that he ſhall have no authority to give ordination *Cheirotenia*, or to advance any man to any eccleſiaſtical function. If this right belonged to the people, the Council would have been very wrong in depriving *Meletius* that Egyptian Biſhop, of a right veſted not in him but in others. In them early days, tho' there were ſome reformers but not of the modern ſchool, 'twas thought that the right of inſtituting ſubordinate paſtors was veſted in the chief Paſtors; the ſheep had not yet learnt to conduct the ſhepherd.

This is ſo true that though the immediate office of the firſt Deacons was to ſuperintend the diſtribution of alms, the Apoſtles directed the people to chuſe men, whom they thought beſt qualified for that purpoſe; but reſerved to themſelves the right of inſtituting them: "'tis not right, ſay the Apoſtles, that we "ſhould neglect the word of God to ſerve at the tables, "conſider therefore brethren ſeven men, having good "teſtimony from yourſelves . . . . . whom we may "conſtitute over this neceſſary work: *ous kataſteſomen "epi tès chercias tautes*;"—*Acts* vi. 2, 3.—but the miniſters of the altar were inſtituted by the Apoſtles without conſulting the people; and ſtrangers frequently ſent from afar, who were not known to the people. St. *Paul* gives repeated inſtructions to his diſciple *Timothy*, Abp. of Epheſus, on that ſubject; and tells *Titus* another of his diſciples that he had left him at Crete expreſsly to

correct what was wanted there, and constitute priests over the cities of that jurisdiction according to the directions which he (the Apostle) had given him: "*ina* "*katasteses kata Polin Presbuterous.*"

We know from authentic history, not from heathen poets or philosophers, that *Linus* was appointed Bishop of Rome. By the Apostles *Peter* and *Paul.—Iren. 3. Lib. 3. Cap. 3*, that *Polycarp* was instituted Bishop of Smyrna, by the Apostle St. *John.—Tert. de Præs.*

Eusebius informs us that *Timothy* was instituted Bishop of Ephesus, and *Titus* Bishop of Crete, by the Apostle *Paul.—Lib. 3. Cap. 4.*

Nicephorous says, that a certain *Plato* was instituted Bishop of a town of barbarians named *Mirmena*, by the Apostle St. *Matthew*; that St. *Mark* was made Bishop of Alexandria by St *Peter.*

We know from *Leo* the *Great—Epist. ad Dios.* 81. that a right of suffrage even in the elections of particular Bishops was neither assumed nor claimed by the laity in the early ages of the Church; their testimony of the man's morals was admitted; but the right of election was confined to the Bishops of the province and the clergy of the vacant Church. St. *Paul* in his instructions to *Timothy* requires the testimony even of these, who were not of the Church: "he ought to "have a good testimony from those, who are without, "least he fall into reproach:"—iii. 6.—The Apostle gives no instructions to the laity about the election of spiritual Pastors: he knew 'twas not their business.

From giving testimony of the morals of candidates in some Churches the laity began to pretend a right to vote on elections, which was considered, as 'twas in reality, an abuse, and checked: the 13th Canon of the Council of *Laodicea* in Phrygia prohibits it in these terms: "It must not be permitted to the multitude to "make the election of those, who are to be promoted "to the priesthood." And in the second Council of Nice, third Canon, an election made by magistrates is declared

declared null: "every election of Biſhop, Prieſt, or "Deacon, by magiſtrates is to remain null: for he "who is promoted to a Biſhoprick muſt be elected by Biſhops."

There is no prohibition to be found againſt the laity, either princes or people, which forbids them to ordain Biſhops or Prieſts: ſuch an extravagant aſſumption, or rather impudent uſurpation of power, never croſſed the wildeſt imagination before the æra of *Luther*: an unfortunate period, fruitful in monſtrous abſurdities; productive of all the different ſects, which now disfigure the face of Chriſtianity, and are continually encreaſing.

The abuſe which this Ex. laviſhes not only on Popes but on the whole body of the Catholic Clergy, of whom perhaps he does not know a ſingle man is refuted by contempt: ſlander is no ſubſtitute to argument.

In his xith. Propoſition the Ex. pretends to prove from the internal evidence of Catholic doctrine that there is no infallibility in the Catholic Church. His reaſoning on the ſubject is extremely curious: "if it "be ſaid, (ſays he, *p.* 80,) that the Church is infal-"lible her deciſions muſt be right however abſurd or "weak they may be." He ſeems to forget that infallibility excludes abſurdity; that to couple them together in the ſame phraſe is nonſenſe. He might reaſon in the ſame manner againſt the infallibility of J. Chriſt, with equal force and propriety: thus if J. Chriſt be infallible his deciſions muſt be right, however abſurd or wicked; he's told that infallibility removes the idea of abſurdity and wickedneſs.

Learned writers, ſays the Ex. have proved that Rome impoſes doctrines contrary to Scripture. By learned writers he ſeems to underſtand ſome pedagogues muttering a few words of Greek and Latin to an admiring populace, and declaiming againſt the harlot of Babylon. When theſe proofs are produced we ſhall

diſcuſs them. Hitherto we have ſeen nothing like proof.

The Ex. inſtances one doctrine contrary to Scripture as he imagines, that is the invocation of ſaints and angels. In proof of this he muſters up a number of texts to ſhew that ſovereign homage is due to God alone, what no Catholic ever denied or even doubted. He adds with ſome confidence, that there is not an inſtance in Scripture of any man's invoking either Saint or Angel. This is not the firſt ſpecimen he has given of the moſt profound ignorance of this very Scripture, in which he muſt find all truths of religion. Let him read the forty eighth chapter of Geneſis, and he will ſee the patriarch *Jacob*, a man of ſome authority, ſeriouſly and ſolemnly invoking an angel, and acknowledging his protection through life: "may the angel of "the Lord, who delivered me from all evil bleſs theſe "boys:"—"*ha Maleak ha goel othi mi cal rah jibraek "eth ha Naariim.*" *Gen.* lviii. 16.—Would the Ex. permit this holy patriarch, who candidly acknowledges that the angel had delivered him from every evil, to ſay once in his life: *Holy Angel pray for me?* or Holy Angel protect me? The patriarch done ſomething more, for we read in the thirty-ſecond of Geneſis, that he prayed an Angel to bleſs him, and *Moſes*, a man of ſome credit adds, "*that the Angel did bleſs "him:*"—"*va jibarek otho ſham.*"

Has not this Ex. read the expreſs order given by God himſelf to the Jews? "Behold, I ſend my Angel "to protect you in the way, and to conduct you to the "place which I have prepared. Beware of him and "hear his voice; don't neglect him for he will not bear "your prevarications, my name is in him:" "*Hiſha-"mer mi Phanaio ve ſhemah Be colo al thamer Boki lo "jiſa le phiſhah chem ki ſhemi be kirbo.*" Though this Angel was expreſsly ſent to protect and conduct the Jews, and they were ſtrictly ordered to hear and obey him, they could not without idolatry in our Ex'rs. opinion

opinion ſay: *Holy Angel protect us:* This is a ſtretch of ſtupidity—it baffles deſcription.

That the Angels do pray for us, we know from ſeveral paſſages in Scripture: in the prophecy of *Zacharias* we read: i. 12. "And the Angel replied and "ſaid, O Lord of Hoſts, how long wilt thou not have "mercy on Jeruſalem and the cities of Juda, with "which thou haſt been angry now theſe 70 years."—"*ve jahan Maleak Jehovah vajomar Jehovah toſibaoth* "*had Mathai Attha lo therechem eth Jeruſhalem veeth* "*ha rei jehoudah aſher zehemathazeh ſhibebim ſhanah.*"

The Angels carried the ſoul of *Lazarus* to the place of reſt.—*Luke* xvi. 23.

At the laſt day Chriſt will ſend his Angels and they will collect his elect from the four winds, and from the ſummit of the heavens.—*Matt.* xxiv. 31.

St. *John* ſaw an Angel offering to God the prayers of the Saints.—*Rev.* viii. 3, 4.

That the Saints are ſimilar to the Angels we know from the expreſs declaration of J. Chriſt: "they are as "the Angels of God in Heaven:"—"*os Angeloi tou* "*theou en ourano eiſi.*"—*Matt.* xxii. "They are "equal to the Angels."—"*iſangeloi gar ciſi.*"——*Luke* xx.

As power is given to the Angels over nations, ſo power is given to the Saints who live with Chriſt. This truth is expreſsly revealed by St. *John*:—"To "him who overcomes and obſerves my works to the "end, will I give power over nations, and he will rule "them with a rod of iron."—*Rev.* ii. 26, 27.

St. *Paul* ſeverely cenſures a ſuperſtitious worſhip which was paid to the Angels by the Colloſians, deceived by ſome falſe teachers, who induced them to believe that there was no acceſs to God but through the mediation of the Angels, thereby deſtroying the mediatorſhip of J. Chriſt, through whom alone and excluſively the Apoſtle ſhews in the firſt and ſecond chapter of his Epiſtle, we have acceſs to God; and that he is the

the head of Angels as of men. Of this truth no Catholic ever doubted; nor did any Catholic ever pray to an Angel or Saint as to a Mediator, but ſimply as an interceſſor, whoſe prayers are more acceptable to God than ours. To God we pray for mercy, grace, and glory, which we hope to obtain through the mediatorſhip of Jeſus Chriſt; to the Angels we pray for none of theſe graces: we aſk their prayers as more effectual than ours, and we have already ſhewn that they pray for us inceſſantly. Hence a religious honor has been at all times paid to them, of this we have many inſtances in the Scriptures beſides theſe already adduced; *Joſue* being told by the Angel that he was Prince of the army of the Lord, fell on his face and adored the Angel: "*jiphol Jehoſhua el phanaio*, "*vajisthacou.*" *Joſue* could not miſtake the Angel for his God, becauſe the Angel had told him that he himſelf was chief of the army of God: "*ani ſar tſiba Je-*"*hovah.*"—*Jos.* v. The Angel exacted a yet greater homage: he ordered *Joſue* to looſe his ſhoes from his feet, becauſe the place on which he ſtood was holy, and *Joſue* done as he was ordered.

The place was not otherwiſe holy, but becauſe 'twas ſanctified by the preſence of the Angel.

We find *John* the Evangeliſt falling proſtrate before the Angel, (ſee ixth. of Rev.) The Ex. who is ſingularly unlucky in his references, ſays, the Angel refuſed to receive this homage—true, the Angel did, and thereby commends his modeſty and humility in refuſing to receive ſuch homage from ſo great and highly favoured an Apoſtle as St. *John*, the beloved diſciple of Jeſus Chriſt; but he will permit us to believe that St. *John* knew ſomething of the Chriſtian religion; that he thought he might without being guilty of idolatry pay a reverential worſhip to the Angel? if not, St. *John* was highly criminal in repeating the offence: for he tells us that again when the viſion was finiſhed: "I *John*, who heard and ſaw theſe things; and after

"I had

" I had heard and ſeen I fell to adore before the feet of " the Angel who ſhewed me theſe things."—*Rev.* xvii. St. *John* was therefore convinced that the Angel's modeſty did not free him from the obligation of paying honor to whom honor is due, according to that inſtruction of St. *Paul* to the Romans.—xiii. 7. This maxim which the Apoſtle practiſed he taught: *Origen*, a very early and well informed writer ſpeaks of it as an univerſal practice in the Church: " the Angel of " the Chriſtian offers his prayers to God through the " only High Prieſt, (J. C.) himſelf, alſo praying " for him, who is committed to his charge."—*Lib.* 8. *Cen. Celſum.* In the fifth book he ſays, " that the " Angels carry up our prayers to God, and bring down his bleſſings to us; in his firſt Homily on *Ezekiel*, he offers a prayer to the Angel of a perſon who is going to be baptized that the Angel would inſtruct him.

The holy martyr *Nemeſian* and his companions writing to St. *Cyprian*, ſay, " let us aſſiſt each other " by our prayers, and beg that we may have God " and Chriſt, and the Angels favourers in all our ac- " tions."—*Ep. Cy.* 77.

Gregory Naziænzen ſays: " the angelical powers " are a ſuccour to us in all that's good."—*Orat.* 4 *v.* In his poems he prays the good Angels to receive his " ſoul at the hour of his death."—*Cam.* 22.

To avoid prolixity let the Ex. and his friends take *Joſeph Mede's* teſtimony. This zealous Proteſtant, in order to ſhew that the Papal power was the kingdom of Antichriſt, has collected the concurring teſtimony of many early writers in ſupport of the doctrine of the invocation of Saints and Angels.—*Book* 3. *Ep.* 16. &c.

In his expoſition of the Prophet *Daniel*, explaining theſe words of the prophecy: " and he adored the " God *Maozim*, and he will raiſe forts to *Maozim*." *Mede* in theſe words diſcovers the Pope to be Antichriſt, and the Saints the forts of *Maozim*. Why ſo? Becauſe, ſays he, *Baſil* preached to the people that the relics

relics of the forty martyrs were towers by which the city was defended;—*Ora. in* 40. *Mar.*—and *Chryſoſtom* ſaid, *Hom.* 32. *ad Rom.*—" That the relics of St. " *Peter* and St. *Paul* were to the city of Rome towers " more aſſured than ten thouſand ramparts." *Mede* ſays that St. *Hilary* found ramparts in the Angels; he cites St. *Gregory*, of Nyſſa, *Gennadius*, *Evagrius*, *Eucher*, *Theodoret*, and the liturgy of the Greeks to the ſame purpoſe. To theſe *Jurieu*, not leſs zealous than *Mede*, and equally intent on proving the Pope to be Antichriſt, and that his reign would continue but 1260 years, adds St. *Ambroſe*, who ſaid that the martyrs Sts. *Jervais* and *Protais* were the tutelar angels of *Milan*, he might have added St. *Gregory*, St. *Jerom*, St. *Auſtin*, the author of that Chapter of the Book of Kings, in which 'tis related that a dead man was raiſed to life by touching the prophet *Eliſha's* bones, 4 *b. of Kings*, xiii. 21. The pious King *Joſias* who reſpected the bones of the prophet, who had foretold the deſtruction of *Bethel*—4 *b. of Kings*, xxiii. 18.—and *Moſes* himſelf who returning from Egypt, took with him the bones of the great patriarch *Joſeph*; in a word all theſe great men of primitive times, whom the world has, does, and will continue to revere, whilſt the prophecies of *Mede*, of *Jurieu* of *Luther* himſelf, and a croud of ſcribbling enthuſiaſts amuſe children and old wives, and afford a ſubject of contempt and deriſion to all men of real ſcience.

Are we aſſured, (ſays the Ex. *p.* 82.) that the Angels are in a ſituation to hear us? We are aſſured by J. Chriſt in very plain language that they rejoice at the converſion of a ſinner;—*Luke* xv. 10.—and common ſenſe aſſures us that they don't rejoice at an event of which they know nothing: two things therefore they muſt know: who are ſinners, and who are ſincere converts: for no reaſon can be aſſigned why their knowledge ſhould be confined to a particular ſinner...

'Tis matter of ſurpriſe how the firſt reformers could

could have prevailed on their deluded followers to believe that we Catholics who publicly profeſs our faith in one God, ſhould notwithſtanding adore many Gods; or that, whilſt we know, and confeſs, that ſovereign homage and ſupreme worſhip is due to the Creator alone, we ſhould pay this homage to any of his creatures. The abſurdity is ſo groſs, that we can't ſufficiently admire the ſtupidity of theſe who permit themſelves to be duped by it; but 'tis a prodigy, that this ſcaffolding, however neceſſary to the architects of that work of darkneſs, which miſrepreſentation had formed, ſhould yet continue notwithſtanding the numberleſs diſſertations publiſhed by Catholic writers, in which the eſſential difference between the veneration, which we Catholics have for Angels and Saints, and the relative reſpect we ſhew their relics and images, and that ſovereign homage and ſupreme honor which we pay our God, is ſo clearly ſtated that even ignorance cannot miſtake it. There muſt be ſome hideous deformities in the work, when ſcaffolding of ſuch monſtrous aſpect is found neceſſary to conceal them.

The very form of prayer which we make to the Virgin and other Saints carries its juſtification: *Holy Mary pray for us.* Such a form of prayer addreſſed to Almighty God would be downright blaſphemy—an abomination. Why ſo? becauſe a prayer in this form ſhews we conſider the perſon to whom 'tis addreſſed as dependent on the will of a ſuperior power. If at any time a Catholic ſhould offer a petition to an Angel or Saint in a more abſolute form, the ſenſe in which 'tis underſtood is manifeſt from the ſubject matter. There are many examples in ſcripture: 'tis ſaid of *Joſue:*— "was not the ſun ſtopped in his anger, and one day "made as two?" *Ecc.* 46. 4.; of *Elias:* "that he "caſt down fire from heaven thrice:" xlviii. 3. "that "he raiſed a dead man from below, from the lot "of death," *ibid.* 5: of *Eliſha*: "that in his life he "did great wonders, and miracles in his death," *ibid.*

" that his dead body propheſied, alluding to the man who was enlivened by his bones." 'Tis ſaid of him, 2 Kings, viii. 1. " *Eliſha* ſpoke to the woman whoſe " child he had made to live," that is, raiſed from the dead, as is related *ch.* iv. and in the viiith. the inſpired writer ſays: " as *Giezi* related to the King how *Eliſha* " had raiſed a dead man, the woman appeared whoſe " child he had raiſed to life." This mode of ſpeaking is not uncommon in the New Teſtament: thus Acts v. 12. we read: by the hands of the Apoſ- " tles many ſigns and prodigies, *ſemeia kai terata*: " were wrought among the people." Did the ſacred penman think that *Joſue* had any power to ſtop the courſe of the ſun? *Elias* any power to bring down fire from the heaven? He or *Eliſha* any power to raiſe the dead? or that in the hands of the Apoſtles there was any power to work ſuch ſigns and prodigies? No, but the ſubject matter explained the ſenſe in which their words muſt be underſtood: that all theſe miracles were wrought by God at the inſtance of his ſervants, whoſe veracity and ſanctity he thus atteſted; hence the inſpired writers aſcribed to the Saints themſelves theſe miracles, which God wrought by their miniſtry.

That a religious reſpect is due and was always ſhewn to Angels, Saints, relics and images of Saints, is manifeſtly revealed in Scripture: we find the Patriarch *Jacob* praying an Angel to bleſs him. *Gen.* xxxii. *Joſue* adoring an Angel. *Jos.* v. The Evangeliſt St. *John* proſtrating himſelf more than once before the Angel who ſpoke to him. *Rev.* xvii.

We have ſome ſtriking examples of the religious reſpect ſhewn to Saints both in the Old and New Teſtament: 'tis ſaid of *Elias*, 1 *Kings*, xvii. that: " When " *Abdias* was in the way *Elias* met him, who, when " he knew him, fell on his face and ſaid: this you, my " Lord *Elias?*" and 2 *Kings*, i. 'tis ſaid that after fire from heaven had conſumed two Captains and their companies

companies in punishment of their disrespect to the Prophet, a third being sent by the King, "he bent his "knees before *Elias*, and prayed him, saying . . . . . "now I beseech you have mercy on my soul, and on "the souls of these fifty men." Or as it is in the Hebrew text: *thicar na naphshi ve nepheſh abadeika elleh chamishim be heneika. Let my life and the life of thy servants these fifty, be of some value in thy eyes.* In the Acts of the Apostles 'tis related that the Apostles were together in Solomon's porch, but that none of the faithful dared to join company with them, "the "people magnified them:" *Acts.* v. 13. The respect shewn the Prophets and the Apostles must have been of a religious nature; they possessed no power or place under Government, to which a civil respect is due.

In like manner we read that the greatest possible respect was paid to the Ark of the Covenant, which was but an image of the throne of God, and the most exemplary punishment inflicted on those who failed in that respect. This punishment was extended even to the heathens: "The Ark of the God of Israel, said they, "shall not stay with us; for his hand is heavy upon "us, and upon *Dagon* our God," 1 *Sam.* v. And in the next chapter we see that 50,000 Jews were struck with death for some irreverence towards the Ark. God also punished *Oza* with death for presuming to put his hand to the Ark: "And the indigna- "tion of the Lord was kindled against *Oza*, and he "struck him for his rashness, and he died there before "the Ark of God." 2 *Sam.* vi. 7.

We know the veneration which was conceived for the Brazen Serpent, on which who ever looked when bit by the fiery serpents, was instantly healed.—*Num.* xxi. The Saviour informs us that this serpent was a figure of himself on his Cross: "as *Moses* lifted up the "serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be "lifted up."—*John* iii. 14.

The respect and veneration shewn to relics and mi-

racles wrought by God to authoriſe this reſpect is clearly revealed both in the Old and New Teſtament: *Moſes* going out of Egypt took with him the bones of the Patriarch *Joſeph*, *Ex.* xiii. *Eliſha*, when his maſter *Elias* was tranſlated in a fiery chariot by Angels, on his return ſtruck the waters of Jordan with the mantle which had fallen from the prophet, ſaying: "where now is the God of *Elias* . . . . and the waters were divided hither and thither, and *Eliſha* paſſed over." 2 *Kings*, ii. 14. What Catholic ever expreſſed ſuch confidence in any relic as this holy prophet did in the mantle of *Elias?* and we ſee God wrought a ſtupendous prodigy to authorize this confidence and atteſt the ſanctity of his ſervant. A more ſtupendous miracle was wrought to atteſt the ſanctity of *Eliſha* himſelf.

'Tis thus related by the inſpired writer: "and *Eliſha* died and they buried him, and plunderers from "*Moab* came into the land the ſame year, and ſome who "were burying a man ſaw the plunderers, and caſt the "body into the ſepulchre of *Eliſha*, and when it touch-"ed the bones of *Eliſha* the man came to life and "ſtood on his feet." 2 *Kings*, xiii. 20, 21. Would the Ex. permit this man, who was raiſed from the dead, or his friends to have ſome reſpect for theſe venerable bones to which he was ſo much indebted.

In the New Teſtament we find many miracles aſcribed to relics: thus *Acts* xix. 11.—"God wrought "ſpecial miracles by the hand of *Paul*, ſo that even "there were brought from his body handkerchiefs and "aprons, and the diſeaſes departed from them and the "wicked ſpirits went out of them." If one of theſe handkerchiefs or aprons had relieved the Ex. from a mortal diſeaſe would he have thrown it aſide to rot? would he ſhew no ſort of reſpect to an inſtrument to which he was indebted for a continuation of life? Why then accuſe us Catholics of ſuperſtition for ſhewing that reſpect to the relics of Saints, which he himſelf in ſimilar circumſtances would have ſhewn, and muſt have

have ſhewn if he retained any remains of gratitude? Does he imagine that we think any inanimate creature poſſeſſed of inherent powers of action? that we think relics capable of producing the effects, which are aſcribed to them? that any inviſible agent reſides in them? if ſo, the writer begs leave to undeceive him, aſſuring him that Catholics were in poſſeſſion of common ſenſe and chriſtianity before the reformation was thought of; that if the words of J. Chriſt be true, they will continue poſſeſſed of both after the reformation is forgotten: "every plant which my heavenly father has "not planted will be eradicated." *Paſa Phuteia en ouk "ephuteuſon o Pater mou ouranios ekriſotheſetai."*—*Matt.* xv. 13.

The Ex. ſeems ſurpriſed that Mr. B. ſhould object to novelties in religion: novelty, he ſays, has nothing to do with truth. No—but novelties of man's invention are not revealed truths; they are not truths of religion. Does he pretend to confound Newton's Aſtronomical Diſcoveries, or Prieſtly's Lectures on Electricity, with Truths of Religion? All novelties are meer human inventions; they were not taught by J. Chriſt, nor did he order his miniſters to teach them: his terms are: "teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever "I have commanded you." *Matt. ult.* and St. *John* cloſing the Revelations, ſays: "if any man will add "to theſe things, God will add to him the plagues "written in this book." *Rev. ult.* 18.

St. *Jude* exhorts the faithful to perſevere in the faith once delivered to the Saints, *St. Jude*, i. He did not think the additions of every fanatical enthuſiaſt neceſſary.

The Proteſtant religion, ſays the Ex. *p.* 84, taking the Scriptures for its only rule and guide, is as old as Chriſtianity. There are almoſt as many errors in this ſhort ſentence as there are words. The New Teſtament is not as old as Chriſtianity.—This truth requires no proof: Chriſtianity was eſtabliſhed before there

there was a line of the New Teſtament written; parts of it were written forty or fifty years after. The Proteſtant does not take the Scriptures for a ſole rule of faith: this has been ſhewn to demonſtration more than once already, and the Ex. himſelf proves in the next page: in it he ſays: that the miniſters direct their congregations to take God's word for their law; and that reaſon, which God gave them for their guidance as their beſt interpreter; hence 'tis evident that their own interpretation of the Scriptures, or as he had ſaid elſewhere, their own fancy, is their ſole rule of faith; but neither their interpretation nor their fancy is the word of God, and the man who thinks it, flatters and deceives himſelf.

That infallible ſupremacy which we ſo juſtly refuſe to the Popiſh Church we do not claim to ourſelves—ſays our Ex. *p.* 85. By this he admits that his Church may deceive and be deceived; that 'tis not the pillar and ground of truth which St. *Paul* expreſſly calls the Church of Chriſt; that 'tis not that Church, in which J. Chriſt himſelf teaches by his miniſters, according to his promiſe: "I am with you to the end of time," in a word, that 'tis not the Church of J. Chriſt out of which there is no ſalvation.

The remainder of this Pamphlet is replete with perſonal ſtrictures on the author of the Letter of Inſtruction, which it pretends to examine: Mr. *Burke* may reply to it if he thinks proper, the writer will not; he concludes with this remark on that production: in it there are many vague aſſertions crouded together without order or proof; many texts adduced either foreign to the ſubject, or concluſive againſt the Ex. not one argument in the Letter of Inſtruction invalidated or even weakened, though that letter ſeems to be drawn up in haſte and the author would do well to reviſe it.

A

TREATISE

ON

THE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIANITY,

IN WHICH ALL DIFFICULTIES STATED BY ANCIENT AND MODERN SCEPTICS, ARE DISPASSIONATELY DISCUSSED.

HALIFAX:
PRINTED BY JOHN HOWE and SON.
1808.

TO THE HONORABLE

HENRY AUGUSTUS DILLON,

Colonel of the 101ſt, or DUKE of YORK's Iriſh Regiment, &c. &c. &c.

SIR,

IN theſe few ſheets you will ſee the univerſally admitted principles of Chriſtianity clearly ſtated, and all exceptions taken by the Heathen Philoſophers, *Celſus*, *Creſcentius*, *Lucian*, and *Julian*, the apoſtate, and from them tranſcribed by their ſucceſſors, modern ſceptics, or, as they are called, modern Philoſophiſts, fairly diſcuſſed. No expreſſion, offenſive to any deſcription of Chriſtians, has eſcaped the writer's pen, which he recollects; his ſtrictures are confined to Anti-Chriſtian Works; the authors he has not named, not through any reſpect for their perſons, which the reader will eaſily perceive, but he did not think proper to point out ſources of immorality and error to idle curioſity; nor would he flatter the vanity of an inſignificant ſcribbler by inſerting his name, though it were but to expoſe him to contempt.

He thinks a work of this nature may with great

great propriety be recommended to the protection of a Statesman, whose eloquence in the Senate, and pen in the Cabinet, have been consecrated to the defence of the general rights of all descriptions of Christians; and whose conduct, as a military character, has received from this town a most honorable testimony.

The writer having no claims nor expectancies from power or protection; no fears nor apprehensions from enmity or malignity, pays this tribute of personal esteem, and begs leave to inscribe the work to a Nobleman, who is perfectly capable of appreciating its value. And is,

With great respect,

Your most obedient humble servant,

E. B. V. G. Que.

Halifax, *Nov.* 8th, 1808.

LAUS CHRISTO DEO NOSTRO EJUS QUE MATRI SEMPER VIRGINI. E. B.

" *Invisibilia enim ipsius a creturâ mundi, per ea quæ facta sunt, intellecta, conspicuntur : sempiterna quoque ejus virtus et divinitas : ita ut inexcusabiles sint.*" *Ad. Rom. C.* 1. *V.* 20.

THE Apostle, in his epistle to the Romans, speaking of the Heathen philosophers, says, that they were not only criminal but inexcusable in their infidelity : this terrific sentence he founds on the most simple, yet irresistible reason : the invisible power of God, and his divinity, are so manifest in his works that no excuse is admissible in extenuation of the sin of infidelity. His words apply with double force to the pretended philosophers of our days, men, the light of whose understanding has been totally extinguished by the depravity of their hearts ; and the strong impressions made in their early days by a Christian education, entirely effaced by profligacy surpassing that of the Heathens whom St. Paul paints in such strong colouring.

By a train of reasoning to demonstrate the existence of a God, a Supreme Being, all wise, all powerful, and eternal, a first cause, which gave existence to us, and to all the other Beings, which compose the universe ; and continues to support that beauty, that harmony, which we admire in the world, is useless : all reasoning is lost on the man who denies it : his heart is callous, and his head insane. The man whose understanding is not warped by the perverseness of his heart sees and feels it.

In compliance with cuſtom the writer ſimply indicates principles of demonſtration which enforce conviction:

1ſt. Let any man now exiſting be conſidered as the laſt term of a ſeries compoſed of individuals in continued ſucceſſion from the commencement; in that ſeries each individual has been father to his ſucceſſor; except the laſt who has no ſucceſſor; and alſo each individual has been ſon to his predeceſſor, except the firſt, who had no predeceſſor, the firſt man therefore in this ſucceſſion muſt have received an exiſtence from an almighty cauſe not included in the ſucceſſion; the writer ſays, almighty, becauſe nothing ſhort of omnipotence could give exiſtence to a Being, which had no previous exiſtence radically in ſome other. To pretend that in this ſucceſſion there was no firſt man is inconſiſtent with reaſon: a regular ſucceſſion of Beings of the ſame ſpecies without a commencement is impoſſible: there is a laſt term, therefore a firſt: firſt and laſt are relative terms. To aſſert that this firſt man made himſelf, is ridiculous in the extreme, and not leſs abſurd to think him the work of chance: a poſitive effect pre-ſuppoſes a poſitive cauſe, and a cauſe capable of producing the effect. Chance is an empty ſound, it conveys no idea, produces nothing. If you ſuppoſe him the work of nature, you are to conſider that nature ſignifies neither leſs nor more than the mechanical laws by which the material world is governed; that theſe laws have an immediate reference to a Being infinite in power and wiſdom to eſtabliſh theſe ſame laws, and execute them. Every part and particle of the material world is ſubject to theſe laws, and, placed in the ſame circumſtances, act invariably in the ſame manner, and thus declare, to the intelligent world, there dependence on, and implicit obedience to, the orders of their God. "*Cæli enarrant Gloriam Dei.*" Ps. 18, v. 2. Let us now conſider this

argument

argument, the force of which is not to be eluded, in another light :

All the individuals who compoſe the ſeries in regular ſucceſſion have exiſted ; the number was not infinite, becauſe it admits an increaſe, and is, in fact, continually increaſing ; infinity admits no increaſe, therefore, there muſt have been a man to begin the ſucceſſion, and as he could not by any poſſibility be ſon to himſelf, or to any of his ſucceſſors, he muſt have had his exiſtence from ſome Being not included in the ſucceſſion. This reaſoning is applicable to the different ſpecies of animated Beings, which ſucceed each other by generation, and as not one of them is capable of giving exiſtence, by generation, to a Being of a different ſpecies, it is manifeſt that they muſt all have received an exiſtence from a Being included in none of thoſe ſucceſſions. To have recourſe to *chance*, to *hazard*, to *nature*, to *ſome unknown powers in matter*, to the *fortuitous concourſe of atoms* and ſuch like cauſes, which, have no exiſtence but in the imagination of wild ſpeculatiſts, is unphiloſophical : a philoſopher aſſigns no cauſe incapable of producing the ſpecific effect, which he examines : What ignorance does the man betray who aſſigns a cauſe incapable of producing any effect at all.

A ſecond principle of demonſtration :

All the Beings which we ſee or know in this viſible world, are contingent, that is, they may or they may not exiſt : we may conceive them in a ſtate of poſſibility, not one of them all is capable of giving itſelf an exiſtence, and much leſs of giving exiſtence to all the other Beings, which form this viſible world ; there muſt therefore be ſome one Being, ſelf-exiſtent, which we cannot conceive, in a ſtate of mere poſſibility. Why ſo ? Becauſe it would be poſſible and impoſſible at the ſame time : poſſible from the ſuppoſition, and impoſſible as it could not give itſelf exiſtence, and could

not

not receive exiſtence from any other Being, all being ſuppoſed non-exiſtent. A firſt cauſe therefore muſt be ſelf-exiſtent, on which all the Beings, which compoſe this viſible world depend for their exiſtence.

A third principle of demonſtration :

Infinite perfection is poſſible : we reaſon on ſome of its properties, though our limited underſtanding cannot form an adequate idea of the whole ; an impoſſible Being, a *ſquare circle*, for example, has no properties ; all we conceive of ſuch a repugnant Being is, that the parts of which it is ſaid to be compoſed, or the properties with which it is inveſted, exclude each other. If infinite perfection be poſſible it muſt neceſſarily exiſt. Why ſo? Becauſe exiſtence is not only the firſt, but the foundation of all perfection.

Whether the belief of a Deity be innate in man, that is impreſſed on his mind, at his entrance into the world, by the author of his being or not, a queſtion which the writer does not undertake to determine, it is certain that there is not, that there never was, a man of ſenſe free from the influence of prejudice or paſſion, who did not believe the exiſtence of a God, and his interference in human affairs ; hence, even amongſt the Heathen nations the mind of man though ſhackled with falſe opinions, abſorbed in ſenſuality, ſubſervient to fictitious divinities, depreſſed by the tyranny of univerſal cuſtom, yet, upon a ſudden emergency, as if awakening from a dream, called on the God of nature : *God knows it*, *God ſees it*, *God will requite*, and ſuch like exclamations, not looking to the temples of falſe deities, but to the Heavens, the throne of that God, whom the ſoul of man naturally adores. If there be, as is pretended by a modern writer, ſome ſavage hordes in the wilds of Africa, or America, who know no Being ſuperior to man, and pay no homage to any divinity, it only ſhews that uncivilized man is capable of being degraded from

from the rank which he was intended to hold in the order of created Beings; and the cauſe muſt be deſperate indeed which has recourſe to the ſavage authority of ſuch men.

From paſſing that bold aſſertion, or rather wild conjecture, of this modern anti-chriſtian, unnnoticed, it muſt not be inferred that the writer believes it true: with reſpect to the wildeſt Savages in America, it is abſolutely falſe, and, if we may judge by analogy, and the report of unprejudiced travellers, it is not more true with reſpect to their uncivilized brethren in the deſarts of Africa and in the Aſiatic Iſlands.

From the principles of demonſtration already propoſed, it is incontrovertibly true that there is a ſelf-exiſtent primary cauſe poſſeſſed of all perfection, from which all the Beings which compoſe the viſible world derive their exiſtence, and on which they eſſentially depend for that portion of time, and ſpace, which they occupy in the world; that this primary cauſe is neither matter, nor any particle or element of matter, is equally evident: for whether matter be compoſed of indiviſible elements, or of elements infinitely diviſible, a queſtion foreign to the ſubject, on which we reaſon, it is moſt certainly compoſed of parts, it therefore eſſentially depends on ſome agent, which is not matter, to effect this compoſition, if it be not thought that matter has not only made, but compoſed itſelf according to its own fancy, which is offenſive to common ſenſe. We ſee matter compoſed and decompoſed according to fixed and invariable laws; we ſee matter ſet in motion, the direction, the compoſition, and decompoſition, of its motion are ſo regular, that they are ſubject to mathematical calculation, and we ſee the ſmalleſt particle of matter ſubject to the ſame laws which are invariably obſerved by the heavenly bodies; the man who from theſe facts is not convinced of the abſolute dependance

of

of matter on its maker, and of its blind ſubmiſſion to the laws, which he has eſtabliſhed, for its compoſition, decompoſition, for its motion, and the direction of its motion, muſt be ſtupidly ignorant of the firſt principles of reaſoning, or perverſely obſtinate, and perſevering in an opinion, not ſimply groundleſs, but inſulting to reaſon.

What is ſaid of matter in general, is applicable to every parcel, and particle of matter: no reaſon can be aſſigned why one particle ſhould poſſeſs power, wiſdom and independence excluſively, to have recourſe to latent powers in matter is ridiculous: we know that matter is capable of receiving impreſſions from external agents, and of making impreſſions according to eſtabliſhed laws, the extent of this capacity we do not know, but from this very capacity we know that matter is dependant, that it is paſſive, incapable of forming any plan, or acting in conſequence of any pre-conceived deſign, of courſe incapable of compoſing that order, which ſubſiſts in the viſible world, the beauty, the harmony, and, the almoſt boundleſs extent of which ſo loudly proclaim the power, the wiſdom and the magnificence of its author.

The writer paſſes in ſilence the ſenſeleſs jargon of Atheiſtical writers, who ſeem to vie with each other in the extravagant abſurdity of the different ſyſtems, which they invent, in order, as they pretend, to account for the preſent order of things, without having recourſe to a primary cauſe.

To the inventive faculties of theſe gentlemen the world is indebted for knowing, that man is a ſort of monkey, in cunning ſurpaſſing the common baboon; as they advance in knowledge we may expect to hear, how a goat made a horſe, or a table built a houſe.

Theſe men, in general, extremely ignorant, yet ambitious of literary fame, conſcious of their inability to ſucceed in common purſuits, endeavour to attract notice

notice by the affected ſingularity of their conceits; to this they add ſtrong declamation charged with invective, which, from the irritability of human nature, is well calculated to inſure ſucceſs. It is uſeleſs to enquire if there be Atheiſts in the world: that there are men who affect to believe there is no God is certain; that there are many who live as if they do not believe the exiſtence of a God is equally certain: that there are men who, on pretended principles of demonſtration, do not believe a God to exiſt, is uncertain.

We know that of civilized Heathens none were ſo impious as to deny the exiſtence of ſome powerful and immortal Being, which ſuperintends this viſible world either immediately or by ſubordinate agents, if you except thoſe ſects, whoſe abominable maxims were known to excite public indignation, who from the practice of ſuch maxims had every thing to fear and nothing to hope. Though the Heathens, abſorbed in ſenſual pleaſures, did not aſcribe omnipotence, and all perfections, to the Deity, yet the idea of a God, however disfigured, was not totally effaced from their minds. Of apoſtates from the Chriſtian faith there may be ſuch monſters: God in puniſhment of their crimes may ſo far extinguiſh the light of their underſtanding as to efface his own impreſſion from their minds.

An Atheiſt, can he be an honeſt man? Yes, if he be not expoſed to a delicate or dangerous temptation, with which he may by diſhoneſty comply, and eſcape public notice with honor and impunity: if he be honeſt in ſuch a conjuncture he is a fool: why may not the actions of an Atheiſt from ſome impulſe of nature be inconſiſtent with his principles at times, ſince we ſee men who believe a God the avenger of crimes, act inconſiſtently with this belief? The Atheiſt therefore may at times be honeſt and upright through an impulſe of nature, notwithſtanding the perverſe tendency of his principles,

ciples, as the Theiſt may at times notwithſtanding the purity of his principles be depraved through the corruption and inſtability of human nature.

This primary agent, on which the viſible world depends, is of neceſſity ſelf-exiſtent, eternal and independent: theſe are perfections, which muſt be aſcribed to a Being poſſeſſing all poſſible perfection: for if you exclude any one of them, you annihilate the idea of a Being infinitely perfect: non-exiſtence deſtroys all ſorts of perfection; and a dependent or temporary exiſtence argues abſolute imperfection, from which a Being infinitely perfect is free; our imagination cannot reach eternity, nor can our underſtanding form an adequate idea of infinite perfection. True, for this ſimple reaſon, theſe faculties in us are limited and cannot extend beyond their ſphere; but our underſtanding eaſily conceives that ſome agent muſt be eternally exiſtent, to give exiſtence to the many Beings which now exiſt; that this agent muſt be omnipotent, as nothing leſs than omnipotence can give exiſtence to a Being, which had none; that this agent muſt be omniſcient, to determine the nature, the properties, the qualities, the place and poſition of ſuch an immenſe variety of Beings forming one whole, in all its parts ſo wonderfully diverſified by the uſeful and the ornamental; that this agent, infinite in power and wiſdom, is infinite in all perfections, becauſe infinity excludes all limitations, and the perfection of any Being is correſpondent to its nature, hence boundleſs perfection in any Being, limited in its nature, is impoſſible, and any limitation of perfection in a Being infinite in its nature, is equally impoſſible.

Theſe are ſimple truths within the ſphere of human underſtanding. To pretend that we know nothing of a Being, becauſe we cannot form an adequate idea of all its properties, or becauſe our limited underſtanding

cannot

cannot clearly and diſtinctly conceive the nature and qualities of any Being, to ſay that ſuch a Being does not exiſt, is to contradict the ſenſe of mankind: Thus for example though we do not know all the properties of a Dog, we know that a Dog is not a Horſe; and though we cannot form an idea of the nature, or phyſical conſtitution of that animal, or determine the ſprings which give it motion, we know that there are dogs, and many in the world, and that they are frequently in motion. On the ſame principles, though we cannot conceive a diſtinct idea of the nature and perfections of a primary cauſe, yet as we ſee a viſible world, which is not ſelf-exiſtent, which has not made itſelf, and as we ſee the different parts, which compoſe this world placed in a certain order, and preſerving for ages their relative poſition, knowing that not one of theſe parts was capable of aſſuming or preſerving its relative poſition, and in fine as we ſee all the Heavenly Bodies, theſe vaſt maſſes of inert matter, placed at ſuch an amazing diſtance one from the other, yet mutually connected and dependent in their motions, we muſt be ignorant indeed, if we do not know that there exiſts a primary cauſe eternal, independent, omnipotent and omniſcient, which gave this viſible world exiſtence, which formed its different parts, placed them in their reſpective poſitions, eſtabliſhed theſe laws of motion by which the ſymmetry and harmony of the whole is preſerved.

To have recourſe to an infinite ſucceſſion of cauſes and effects without a primary cauſe, ſtrongly marks the ignorance of the Atheiſtical writer. For if it be impoſſible for an effect to exiſt without a cauſe, it will be at leaſt equally impoſſible for many effects to exiſt without a cauſe, and the height of abſurdity to pretend, that an infinite number of effects could exiſt without a cauſe; which muſt be the caſe in the ſuppoſition of an

infinite ſucceſſion, as all the cauſes in that ſucceſſion muſt have been effects of preceding cauſes. Hence the Atheiſt under pretence of removing a difficulty encreaſes it, or rather makes it infinitely great. To ſay nothing of the abſurdity of an infinite ſucceſſion continually increaſing, as if infinity were capable of any increaſe.

The immutability of this primary cauſe is an immediate and neceſſary conſequence of the abſolute neceſſity of its exiſtence: for as this cauſe is eſſentially ſelf-exiſtent, it cannot poſſibly ceaſe to exiſt, no more than a circle can ceaſe to be round; and as no being either created or increated is in exiſtence without properties correſpondent to its nature, hence it follows that the properties or perfections of an increated and eternal Being are increated and eternal, the perfections of a Being eſſentially exiſtent, are eſſentially exiſtent, cannot of courſe ceaſe to exiſt, can neither increaſe nor diminiſh, this primary cauſe therefore cannot ceaſe to be, nor are its perfections ſubject to the ſhadow of mutation.

Juſtice, wiſdom, goodneſs, &c. in created Spirits are accidental qualities, becauſe their ſpirits are in their nature contingent, and from a ſtate of non-exiſtence, have been by the almighty power of a primary cauſe brought into exiſtence; their qualities are correſpondent to their nature, they may exiſt, or ceaſe to exiſt, and conſequently increaſe or diminiſh; but in God this primary cauſe there are no accidental qualities: They are incompatible with the divine nature. God is not ſaid to be good and juſt as if goodneſs and juſtice were qualities inherent in him; but becauſe that he is in himſelf the ſource of all goodneſs, and the fountain of all juſtice.

He is equally immutable in his decrees: for as he cannot increaſe in knowledge, he can have no motive to change, and to change without a motive is an argument of levity inconſiſtent with his nature.

This

This primary cauſe is infinite in its nature and in all its perfections : limitation argues a dependence on ſome other cauſe or receptacle, which in a primary cauſe is repugnant, and ſince the primary cauſe has not given, nor could not give itſelf exiſtence, nor properties correſpondent to its exiſtence, it can give them no limitation. The infinitude therefore of its nature and perfections is manifeſt.

Some perfections, ſuch as juſtice and mercy infinite, may ſeem inconſiſtent. To obviate this difficulty, which may embarraſs the uninformed mind, it muſt be conſidered that juſtice is not ſaid to be infinite becauſe it never remits any part of the penalty, it would confound juſtice with cruelty, and totally exclude clemency. In the caſe of vindictive juſtice, the only ſpecies of juſtice which can at all be thought inconſiſtent with mercy, the puniſhment of the criminal is intended to ſecure tranquility, to ſatisfy the injured, and prevent future aggreſſion ; if theſe objects be attained without inflicting the whole of the puniſhment, is not clemency conſiſtent with juſtice ? God is ſaid to be infinitely juſt, not becauſe he never forgives, nor remits any part of the puniſhment due, but becauſe he never remits without ſome cauſe known to his wiſdom, which is his rule of action ; in like manner he is ſaid to be infinitely merciful, not becauſe he never puniſhes ; but becauſe there is no crime ſo great, which he may not pardon, when he is to forgive, or when he is to puniſh his infinite wiſdom and ſovereign will determines. A temporal Prince either through ignorance, or inattention (the reſpect due to God's repreſentative, does not permit the writer to make uſe of a more harſh term) frequently pardons regardleſs of juſtice ; and as frequently puniſhes in prejudice of clemency, forgetting that he is himſelf ſubject to the natural law, and accountable to God, if not to his ſubjects, for the uſe or abuſe of the

power

power with which he is inveſted: the abuſe of power is impoſſible in our God: he is neither ſubject to ignorance, prejudice, precipitation nor malice: they are incompatible with his nature, he pardons or he puniſhes according to the dictates of ſovereign wiſdom; ſo that mercy and juſtice are ſo far from being inconſiſtent in him, that they are not even diſtinct, but all one and the ſame identified with his eſſence. This primary cauſe is one ſimple and indiviſible: if more than one, they would be diſtinguiſhed by ſome perfection or imperfection, all imperfection is excluded from a Being infinitely perfect, and one cannot poſſeſs a perfection which the other does not, it would argue a defect, hence there could be no diſtinction, conſequently no plurality.

This primary cauſe eſſentially ſelf-exiſtent and giving exiſtence to all other Beings muſt poſſeſs the plenitude of being, therefore there cannot be a ſecond: becauſe in that ſuppoſition neither would poſſeſs the Being poſſeſſed by the other, neither formally, nor eminently, as the Creator poſſeſſes all the perfections of his creatures, conſequently neither the one nor the other would poſſeſs the plenitude of being.

This reaſoning is applicable to the wiſdom, to the knowledge, to the power, to all the attributes of the Deity: their plenitude evidently excludes a plurality of Gods.

A ſecond principle of demonſtration is aſſumed from the unity of the world; the diſpoſition of all its parts, their mutual connection, and dependence, ſhew them to have been formed and placed in their reſpective poſitions by the ſame Architect: if they had been formed and placed by different architects that mutual dependance, which Aſtronomers calculate with mathematical preciſion, could not ſubſiſt. To have recourſe to a mutual agreement between agents equal in power ſhews the dependence of each on the other and excludes a ſupreme and independent power. The

The Heathen philoſophers from the unity of the world, the harmony and ſymmetry, the mutual connection and dependence of all its parts, ſaw the neceſſity of admitting one ſupreme and independent God, it is aſtoniſhing, that they did not ſee the abſurdity of fictitious Deities, ſubordinate and dependent, as if ſubordination and dependence were not totally irreconcileable with the divine nature.

In this viſible world there are ſo many appearances, which ſeem to contradict the idea of the whole being diſpoſed by ſovereign wiſdom; and in the moral world ſo many actions which ſeem inconſiſtent with the general principles of human nature, that ſome Philoſophers unable to account for theſe appearances in the viſible world, and much leſs for the innumerable evils, which are manifeſt in the moral world, thought there were two principles equal and independent. The one ſovereignly good, the other ſovereignly evil. This opinion abſurd in itſelf, and contradictory in the terms, as one firſt principle, evidently excludes a ſecond, has been revived, and embelliſhed by ſome modern writers, no abſurdity is too groſs for men, who graſp at particular applauſe. *Popularis auræ vile Mancipium.* To obviate the difficulties which are propoſed by theſe writers, and invalidate all the reaſons, which are offered in defence of this ridiculous opinion, it muſt be conſidered that a primary cauſe acts by general laws, it gives motion to all ſecondary cauſes, but does not deprive them of that action which is correſpondent to their nature, hence whenever any defect appears, it muſt proceed from the obſtruction which one ſecondary cauſe gives the other, the primary cauſe does not produce the defect, nor indeed the ſecondary, a defect has no efficient cauſe, it argues a deficiency, which muſt be found in all ſecondary cauſes, becauſe they are limited. As to any monſtrous appearance or

any

any derangement in the visible world, they are evidently defects; for where there is no defect, there is nothing monstrous, no derangement. Hence we easily conceive that, all these defective appearances are natural consequences of the plan, which the great Architect of this visible world proposed, and the laws, which he in consequence established.

This reasoning is applicable with equal force to the moral world: for all the disorders, all the crimes, and evils consequent and antecedent to these crimes, all the miseries, of which they are productive, are the natural consequences of that liberty of determination, and action, which is natural to man, and without which he would not be a man, but an automaton, a machine set in motion by springs at the option of an external agent.

But why not deprive man of that liberty which is so pernicious to himself and others? This simple reply may suffice. Because man is not a machine, nor was he intended to be set in motion by springs, or the laws of attraction and adhæsion, which inanimate matter obeys.

This question proposed under a thousand different forms, and incessantly repeated, betrays an inexhaustible fund of ignorance. It might be asked with equal propriety, or rather with less absurdity, why man is not deprived of his legs and arms, for he frequently abuses both: and a man deprived of reason, the foundation of free agency, is a more deplorable object, than a man without legs or arms.

To say that a God sovereignly good is obliged to avert all evil from his creatures is an assertion which surpasses if possible the former in absurdity. Why so? Because evil is not a positive existing Being, it consists in some defect, and all creatures are essentially defective. To oblige him then to avert all evil, is to oblige him to create

create Beings infinitely perfect, which is impossible. But is he not obliged to avert moral evil, *that is*, the perverse actions of intelligent creatures, and the miseries consequent thereto? From himself unquestionably. Hence he can do nothing inconsistent with sovereign wisdom, which is his rule of action; nor can he command, exhort, advise, consent to, or countenance any moral action in his creatures inconsistent with the dictates of right reason, or what is called the natural law. To oblige him to deprive man of that liberty of determination, and action, which as man he possesses; which is not simply a gift of the greatest value to man, as the right use of it founds his happiness here and hereafter; but one of the constituent attributes of man, to oblige him, I say to deprive man of that liberty is, in other terms, to say, that he ought not to have made man a rational Being. But could he not prevent the abuse of liberty? Most certainly. He wants neither power nor wisdom to do it. Why not prevent it? For reasons known to his wisdom. This last question is not less impertinent than if it were asked, why he did not make the Frog as pleasing to the sight as the Peacock. And the answer equally simple. Because he thought proper to make the one a Frog, and the other a Peacock.

That liberty is grosly abused, we know by experience; that it is not abused with impunity, the man, who does not know it now, will certainly know it hereafter, the man, who does not believe it, thinks a God of infinite sanctity capable of encouraging iniquity, an opinion more absurd never insulted the sense of mankind.

But supposing a criminal abuse of liberty foreseen, and a perseverance to the end of life, entailing endless misery, is it consistent with sovereign goodness to create a man in this supposition? It would be inconsist-

ent,

ent, not only with goodneſs and mercy, but with juſtice and ſanctity, to create a man for that end, and with that view, or to beſtow on man liberty, the proper uſe of which would be impoſſible, and the abuſe natural and neceſſary; but to create a man a free agent, the proper uſe of whoſe liberty is natural, though not neceſſary, and the abuſe of which is unnatural, though not impoſſible, is perfectly conſiſtent with goodneſs and mercy. Why ſo? Becauſe the abuſe of any thing good in itſelf does not make it bad, it only ſhews the perverſeneſs of the perſon, who abuſes it. The very abuſe of liberty ſhews the excellence of the gift: for what is bad cannot be abuſed. The corruption of the mind, by the perverſeneſs of the will, ſhews the native goodneſs of human nature. Why ſo? Becauſe corruption deprives a ſubſtance of a certain degree of goodneſs, it muſt therefore poſſeſs, it and though reduced in goodneſs, whilſt it remains in exiſtence, the ſubſtance is yet good, becauſe it is yet corruptible. If it be not ſaid that corruption renders a ſubſtance incorruptible, the greateſt of all abſurdities.

From this reaſoning it is evident that all ſubſtances are good in themſelves. That evil is nothing poſitive, that it conſiſts in the corruption of what is good, argues a deficient, not an efficient cauſe. If a previous knowledge of the abuſe of any gift were a ſufficient inducement to retract it, there are but few of the gifts of God, to his creatures, which would not be withdrawn: are not the very neceſſaries of life abuſed? Yet what man, in his reaſon will pretend that theſe gifts are not good in themſelves, and worthy of their Author? If therefore an intelligent Being, through the perverſeneſs of his own will, abuſes that reaſon, which conſtitutes it intelligent, and diſtinguiſhes it from all creatures, which are not intelligent, giving it a decided ſuperiority, in the order of created Beings, it is but juſt and

reaſonable

reaſonable that it ſhould be excluded from the rank which it was intended to hold; and though this excluſion, and the miſery conſequent to it, be not a good to the Being which ſuffers, it is good that it ſhould ſuffer: becauſe juſtice requires it, and in all this there is nothing which is not perfectly conſiſtent with the idea of a Being ſovereignly good, and ſovereignly oppoſite to evil, which it can neither encourage nor countenance.

To conclude, there is no inconvenience that God ſhould create a Spirit, active and intelligent, free from external or internal reſtraint in its determinations, though he foreſees that, this Spirit will abuſe its powers, and perſevere in that depraved ſtate: why ſo? Becauſe however perverſe, malicious or depraved, it yet ſurpaſſes all inanimate Beings; in the dignity of its nature it is ſuperior to the material world, and there is but the dignity of its nature to be aſcribed to its Maker, its malice and depravity to itſelf. The furious tyger is ſuperior to the inoffenſive ſtone, and the drunkard to the wine which intoxicates him. The wine is good, the man, though intoxicated, better. If it be conſiſtent with ſovereign goodneſs to create the wine why not the man? Non-exiſtence may appear preferable to endleſs miſery. Diſpoſed as the writer is at preſent he would not heſitate nor deliberate on the choice; yet if we judge by experience the contradictory is true: for all men are expoſed to inevitable miſery, and few, who are not actually involved in it; yet life in miſery is preferred to death, and the Atheiſt, of all wretched men, the moſt wretched here, fears death moſt, notwithſtanding that ſtate of non-exiſtence, which he fondly promiſes himſelf.

From what has been ſaid on this ſubject, appears the extravagance of aſcribing to a Being ſovereignly malignant, what is called evil, whether phyſical or moral,

for ſuch a Being, if a ſubſtance muſt be good, all ſubſtances are, and if not a ſubſtance, cannot be an agent, can produce nothing.

Beſides all the evils, of which the world complains, are natural conſequences of the plan propoſed and the order eſtabliſhed by its great Creator. The very complaint of evil is an acknowledgment that the order itſelf is good; becauſe evil is nothing elſe but a deviation from this order. As to the objections drawn from the premature death and ſufferings of children, and the pains, to which unoffending beaſts, are ſubject, they will be diſcuſſed in the courſe of this work.

It may not be unneceſſary to obſerve that a ſtate of trial, in which an intelligent Being acting with rectitude according to the dictates of that reaſoning faculty, which diſtinguiſhes it, may attain happineſs, and if perverting this faculty and abuſing its powers of determination and action, it may be expoſed to miſery, is perfectly conſiſtent with the idea which we have of the wiſdom, the goodneſs and juſtice of the Supreme Being.

Wiſdom is the ſource and principle of order: order requires, that rectitude of conduct, when freely choſen, ſhould be rewarded, and that depravity, if obſtinate and perſevering, when rectitude is poſſible, ſhould be chaſtiſed, a ſtate of trial is therefore conſiſtent with wiſdom.

It is equally conſiſtent with goodneſs, to reward virtue when free from reſtraint, is an effect of goodneſs, a ſtate in which virtue and vice are equally poſſible, is therefore conſiſtent with it. An action if not free from external or internal neceſſity, may be virtuous or vicious, but not the agent. The agent and not the action deſerves reward or puniſhment; it is therefore of indiſpenſable neceſſity that to deſerve either reward, or puniſhment, the action ſhould be the effect of choice.

choice. That this ſtate of trial is conſiſtent with juſtice is evident on the expoſition: juſtice gives to every man that, which of right belongs to him. If he be not maſter of his actions, he has no title, he deſerves neither reward nor puniſhment. Is a man who falls from a houſe, though he may eſcape unhurt, entitled to a reward? Or a ſoldier who does not fly over a rampart deſerving of puniſhment?

To obviate numberleſs difficulties propoſed by wild ſpeculatiſts and practical Atheiſts, who from the irregularity of their conduct, having nothing to hope, and every thing to fear, endeavor to perſuade themſelves, and others, that there is not a God; or if there be, that he muſt be indifferent to actions, as they pretend, of inevitable neceſſity. It muſt be conſidered that philoſophers proceed to demonſtrate the exiſtence of any cauſe *à priori* as they term it, that is by ſhewing immediately that the cauſe does exiſt, and why it exiſts, or *á poſteriori*, that is, concluding from the effects, the exiſtence of the cauſe. The former is the more forcible and the more perſuaſive: the conviction, which it impreſſes on the mind is not to be effaced; the latter mode of demonſtration if inconſiſtent with the former, muſt contain a fallacy, whether the human mind detects it or not, becauſe truth is not incompatible with truth, but veriſimilitude is reconcileable with falſhood; hence it follows that all the difficulties, which are propoſed, or the objections, which can poſſibly be ſtated againſt a truth founded on immediate demonſtration are ineffectual. Whether theſe objections appear capable of an immediate and deciſive ſolution, or incapable, they only argue the fertility of the inventor's imagination, or the limitation of his underſtanding, but they cannot affect the truth.

It muſt be alſo remarked that there are numberleſs truths capable of immediate demonſtration, with reſ-

pect

pect to certain claſſes in ſociety, which, with reſpect to others, are not only incapable of demonſtration, but abſolutely repugnant to their ideas: thus an Aſtronomer demonſtrates on phyſical, and mathematical principles, the magnitude of any planet, its denſity, if there be an attendant ſatellite, its attractive force and extent, the figure of its orbit, and time of its revolution, all which truths are as myſterious to the unlettered Captain, as the moſt inconceivable truths of religion. Mathematical and phyſical truths he implicitly believes, becauſe they lay him under no reſtraint, the truths of religion he denies, becauſe they contradict his vicious inclinations; againſt the former he offers no objection, becauſe he does not underſtand the ſubject; againſt the latter, though equally ignorant, he ſtates a thouſand difficulties. The gratification of his ſenſual appetites, is therefore the motive of his judgment, and his only rule of action, ſo true it is, that no man ever denied the exiſtence of a God but he, who feared his juſtice; nor did any man ever think him inſenſible or indifferent to his actions, if they were not vicious. To this may be added that, there are truths, capable of the moſt rigid demonſtration, not only inconceivable to the unlettered but to the informed part of mankind, and which in fact appear repugnant to reaſon; thus, for example, the Mathematician demonſtrates the hyperbolical curve, if extended to infinity, inceſſantly approaches its aſſymptots, but cannot touch them. The demonſtration of this truth, however repugnant it may appear to our ideas, is mathematically exact, therefore all objections againſt this truth in whatever form they are ſtated, whatever appearance of demonſtration they may aſſume, whether capable of ſolution or not, are fallacious.

Theſe principles ſolve in the moſt deciſive manner, all the objections ſtated by Atheiſts againſt the exiſtence

ence of a God, and by Deiſts againſt his ſuperintending providence: they give a ſimple and ſatisfactory anſwer to all their enquiries. If there be a God the Creator of all things, why create the tyger, the rattle-ſnake? Why the fly or the beetle? The writer does not know why he created them; but as they are not ſelf-exiſtent, have not made themſelves, could not be made by any other Being equally impotent, they muſt have been created, and, as there is no action without an agent, there muſt be a Creator, though the writer does not know for what immediate end he created a vaſt number of creatures diſguſting to our ſight, and taſte, and noxious to our bodies, yet in their proportions, their preſervation, and propagation, he ſees the moſt evident marks of his power and wiſdom.

This anſwer is applicable to the enquiries of the Manichean, and modern Philoſopher. If there be but one principle ſovereignly good, why does he ſuffer moral evil? We do not know why he permits it, but we know that a Being ſovereignly malignant is a mere chimæra: for by a Being ſupremely malignant is underſtood, either a Being infinitely oppoſite to a Being ſovereignly good, or a Being poſſeſſed of the ſame perfections, ſubſtituting malevolence in the place of benevolence. There is but a non-entity deſtitute of every perfection and infinitely oppoſite to a Being poſſeſſed of all perfection, a non-entity cannot be an agent either good or bad. Wiſdom, power, juſtice, mercy and malevolence are attributes which exclude each other. So that no ſuch Being exiſts or can exiſt. Hence then whether we can or cannot account for the exiſtence of moral evil under the direction of one God ſovereignly good, to admit a malevolent principle independent of equal power, wiſdom, &c. is a groſs abſurdity.

That pretended indifference, which the modern Philoſopher has introduced, with which he feeds his fancy, and

and flatters his ſenſuality, is equally abſurd : the vigilant attention of the Creator to the inanimate, and irrational part of this viſible world, is evident in the motion of the Heavenly Bodies, the invariable laws to which they are ſubject ; in the preſervation, and propagation of the ſeveral ſpecies of brutes. What extravagance to pretend that he ſhould neglect the rational part of the world ? That his cares ſhould be confined to the more ignoble part of his works, and the intelligent part, from which only he can obtain his tribute of praiſe and gratitude, be neglected ? But ſays the Deiſt if his providence ſuperintends the world why permit ſo many diſorders which are evident in the world ? The writer replies once more we do not know why he permits them ; but ſince they are diſorders, therefore there is an univerſal order, for a diſorder is neither leſs nor more than a deviation from order, and where there is no order there can be no deviation from it, an univerſal order argues an univerſal cauſe to eſtabliſh and ſupport it ; the man who pretends that in the world there is neither order nor diſorder, that human actions are neither virtuous nor vicious, all equal and indifferent, to murder a loving mother not more criminal than to ſave her from the jaws of a hungry lion, is not to be reaſoned with, but either confined in a mad houſe, or hunted from ſociety like a wild beaſt of the moſt deſtructive kind.

The Chriſtian Philoſopher aſſigns the moſt ſatisfactory reaſons to juſtify providence in the diſtribution of good and evil in the preſent life, and from that diſtribution concludes the immortality of the ſoul with the utmoſt certainty. That ſubject will be diſcuſſed in the courſe of this work. We ſhall now proceed to conſider our God, this primary cauſe, under another point of view, *that is*, as infinitely intelligent.

It is ſaid of man that he knows, when he ſees, hears, feels

feels or remembers, what he has ſeen, heard or felt, or draws concluſions from his ideas and ſenſations. This is not applicable to God: in him there is no mutability of thought, no tranſition from thought to thought, no concluſions drawn from principles, no train of reaſoning: that mind is moſt comprehenſive, which contemplates the greateſt number of objects at the ſame inſtant, and by the ſame act. God being infinite in all his attributes, his mind infinitely comprehenſive, views all objects paſt, preſent, future and poſſible by the ſame act and at the ſame inſtant, this act of contemplation in God is not any thing diſtinct from the divine nature, it is God himſelf contemplating. The ſcience of God being identified with the divine nature, is infinite as the divine nature, and immutable; ſcience in man is an inherent quality, from the limitation of the human mind it cannot exceed a certain meaſure, God is known to us in part, we know him to be incomprehenſible to any created underſtanding, but the ſcience of God being identified with the divine nature God perfectly knows himſelf, and ſees himſelf, immediately in his own nature, from the infinitude of the divine nature no created object can repreſent it, hence God ſees all his creatures in himſelf, that is, in his eſſence; but he cannot ſee his eſſence in his creatures, for even collectively taken they cannot poſſeſs that perfection, which is neceſſary to repreſent the divine eſſence, God therefore ſees himſelf immediately in his own nature. It is manifeſt that all his creatures are known to him, whether they actually exiſt, are to exiſt, or remain in a ſtate of mere poſſibility. Why ſo? Becauſe as he perfectly knows himſelf he knows his power of creating, and his will: the exiſtence of all created Beings being ſolely dependent on the will of God, he muſt know them, or they could not exiſt, and all the effects of cauſes determined by the laws, which he has eſtabliſhed for the

preſervation

preſervation and direction of the material world are equally dependent on his will, there are therefore but the determinations of free agents, the actions of intelligent Beings ſubject to any difficulty ; but as the exiſtence of many creatures depends eventually on theſe determinations of free agents, and the exiſtence of all creatures depends eſſentially on the will of God, it is impoſſible that he ſhould foreſee the one without foreſeeing the other : the exiſtence of all his creatures he muſt know, he muſt of courſe know the determinations of intelligent and free agents, by which as ſecondary cauſes, he gives exiſtence to many of his creatures. This preſcience in God is infallible, eternal and immutable : there is nothing in God which is not ſo, nothing which is not identified with his nature ; but it impoſes no ſort of neceſſity on the free agent : for at the ſame time that God knows that, ſuch or ſuch an agent will form ſuch or ſuch a determination, produce ſuch or ſuch an act, he knows that the agent will determine itſelf, and act freely, if the agent be active and free in its nature ; or be determined by ſome external cauſe, if the agent be incapable of determining itſelf. Why ſo ? Becauſe all ſecondary cauſes act according to their nature ; hence though the preſcience of God be immutable, the action is contingent, becauſe the preſcience of God is identified with his nature, and immutable as he is himſelf ; but the action which is the object of this preſcience, is inherent in one of his creatures, contingent as all creatures are, free if the creature be free, and neceſſitated, if it be a blind cauſe.

What God foreſees will infallibly happen. True, but it will happen as he foreſees it, that is, freely if the agent be free from reſtraint, or neceſſarily if the agent be ſubject to internal or external neceſſity. But what God foreſees muſt of all neceſſity happen ; yes, for it is not poſſible to foreſee an event which will not happen, if,

If therefore the event be foreſeen, it will infallibly happen; but this preſcience impoſes no neceſſity on the agent, nor is it the mediate, or immediate cauſe of its determination: thus for example if I ſee a man fall from a houſe, the man muſt of all neceſſity fall, or it would be impoſſible for me to ſee him fall; but my ſight impoſes no neceſſity on the man, nor is it the mediate or immediate cauſe of his fall: it is not becauſe God foreſees the man's determination that the man determines to act in ſuch or ſuch a manner; but it is becauſe the man determines, that God foreſees it; as in the caſe of the fall, it is not becauſe I ſee him that the man falls; but it is becauſe he falls that I ſee him.

But if the man did not come to that preciſe determination God would be deceived! No, for he would not have foreſeen it, it is impoſſible to foreſee an event which will not happen.

To obviate a difficulty, which may ſeem embarraſſing, that is, how it is poſſible to foreſee the determination of the mind, which is in itſelf indetermined, and miſtreſs of its actions, it muſt be conſidered that the mind is itſelf dependent on God for its exiſtence, and that all its inclinations are known to him, as are alſo the particular circumſtances in which it is placed, this is certainly more than ſufficient to ſhew a Being of infinite intelligence, what will be its determination. This preſcience of God ſees the effect which is not yet in exiſtence, but will infallibly happen, though it is not the cauſe of that effect, nor does it impoſe any neceſſity on the agent, as if by revelation I know that it will rain on a certain day: can any previous knowledge be conſidered as the cauſe of the rain? If the medium aſſigned be thought inſufficient to juſtify the infallibility and immutability of God's preſcience, let it be conſidered alſo that God is independent on his creatures, that they are all dependent on him; that his preſcience

identified with his nature is immutable and infallible as the divine nature; he therefore invariable in himself, sees all things vary, unchangeable in himself he sees all things change, without any succession of thought, or transition from thought to thought, he sees all things in succession. In what medium? In himself, that is, in his will, all those beings, which are determined to have an existence in any circumstance of time; in his power, all Beings, which are merely possible, and all their possible relations; in the order of causes he sees their effects, and as the human will is the immediate cause of its own actions, and determinations, in the will he sees its determinations. The existence of an immense variety in the succession of Beings, depends on, or rather results from the determinations of the human will; does it follow that, God in giving existence to these Beings, is dependent on the determinations of the will in the execution of the plan which he has proposed in the creation of the world and the succession of the Beings which compose it? No! but it follows that, from eternity he saw at the same instant, and in the same view, all causes and effects whether naturally resulting, or free determinations, that of course he is dependent on the order which he himself established in the execution of his plan; and since in the order of Beings there are many intellectual causes, he owes to himself to preseve their nature entire, taking the result of their determinations into the plan of his operations.

As in his essence God sees all his creatures, has a clear, a distinct and adequate knowledge of their nature, and operations, it may be suspected that evil being a corruption of nature God may not know it, as in the divine essence there is no example of evil: to this the writer replies that evil is known by its opposite good, as falshood is known by its opposite truth, neither

ther evil nor falſhood can be known in themſelves, or in any repreſentation, falſhood is a negation of truth, and evil a negation of goodneſs, negations have no qualities, of courſe cannot be repreſented.

It is uſeleſs to remark that this primary cauſe infinitely perfect is not matter, nor any particle or element of matter: matter is ſo far from being infinitely perfect, that it is ſubject to all ſorts of imperfections; all matter is compoſed. A more powerful agent is therefore neceſſary to effect this compoſition, every element of matter is circumſcribed and dependent on the circumjacent elements for the place which it occupies in this viſible world, which is inconſiſtent with the nature of a primary cauſe infinite and independent.

It was formerly aſſerted by an impious Atheiſt, under the aſſumed title of Philoſpher, that in this viſible world there was but one indiviſible ſubſtance, that all other things were but modifications of this one ſubſtance, which he qualified with the title of God, ſo that the ox's horns and the aſs's ears were but modifications of this pretended God. They might ſerve to adorn the head of the inventor of a ſyſtem, in which it is difficult to determine whether impiety or abſurdity prevails.

No abſurdity can be greater than to pretend that an univerſal ſubſtance exiſts, and not individuals in which it exiſts, as if humanity exiſted, not men, as if men compoſed of bones, fleſh, &c. were not ſubſtances, but modifications of this imaginary univerſal ſubſtance; nor is there any impiety greater than to pretend that, this imaginary ſubſtance, in which modifications are ſuppoſed inherent, which exclude each other, as heat and cold, the cruelty of the tyger, and the meekneſs of the lamb, is a God. The writer paſſes unnoticed his axioms, definitions, and pretended demonſtrations: againſt rank nonſenſe it is uſeleſs to reaſon.

From

From the principles hitherto laid down, it is manifeſt that there exiſts a primary cauſe, almighty, independent, infinitely perfect, ſovereignly wiſe and intelligent, ſeeing from eternity all future events, whether reſulting from natural cauſes, or the determinations of free agents, permitting all ſecondary cauſes to act according to their nature, and diſpoſing all events according to the order of that general plan, which in his wiſdom he has formed; it is alſo manifeſt that this primary cauſe is one, ſimple and indiviſible, excluding multiplicity, and compoſition, whether phyſical or metaphyſical; that in this cauſe there are no inherent qualities, no attributes diſtinct from the divine nature, or from each other; that when we ſpeak of the mercy, the juſtice, the power, the wiſdom, &c. of the Divinity, it is the ſame divine nature, which we conſider under different points of view, the limitation of our underſtanding preventing us from taking in all theſe attributes at the ſame view.

That in the order of Beings, which compoſe the univerſe, there are many intelligent Beings ſubordinate to this firſt great cauſe, is manifeſt from the idea which we have of truth, of goodneſs, of juſtice, &c. which are merely intellectual, and fall under none of our ſenſes: truth for example has neither colour, taſte, ſmell nor ſound, nor can it come into contact with us; it conſiſts in the conformity of the attribute with its ſubject; of it we have a clear, a diſtinct idea, not from any one of our ſenſes, it is therefore purely intellectual, and ſhews that this intelligent faculty is inherent in us.

We are now to conſider whether this thinking principle within us, this intelligent Being, which reaſons and directs, and to which many, though not all the movements of our bodies, when well diſpoſed are ſubject, be material or ſomething diſtinct from matter.

If

If we believe the Materialiſt there is nothing in this univerſe but matter ; of courſe our reaſoning faculty is an attribute of matter ; our moſt elevated thoughts our moſt abſtract ideas are modifications of matter. A Philoſopher celebrated in certain ſchools, the once ſilent retreats of truth and ſcience ; but from which both have been baniſhed, at firſt by the iron hand of power, and in ſucceeding ages by prejudice, paſſion and penal ſtatutes, pretends, that matter, though compoſed of parts, may receive from almighty power the faculty of thinking ; he might as well pretend that, a circle without ceaſing to be a circle, might become a triangle ; the power of God extends to every thing which is poſſible, that is, to every thing the conſtituent parts, or attributes of which, do not exclude each other, ſuch chimeras are not the objects of power. If the principles of this Philoſopher be admitted, we may expect to hear a diſſertation on the nature and effects of fire, by a learned pot ; for if one particle of matter be poſſeſſed of the faculty of thinking, no reaſon can be aſſigned why all others ſhould be excluded.

The operations of the mind eſſentially exclude the idea of matter. Of whatever nature the primary or component elements of matter be whether diviſible or indiviſible a queſtion as yet undetermined, matter is itſelf moſt certainly diviſible and compoſed of parts. The operations of the mind are indiviſible, and as the modifications of any ſubject are of the ſame nature with the ſubject itſelf, being nothing elſe but the ſubject modified, if the modifications or operations of the mind are indiviſible, of all neceſſity the mind muſt be ſo. We have an idea of truth, an idea of thought. Truth is not diviſible nor is thought half a truth, or half a thought is a mere chimera of which we can form no idea

Add to this that matter can never act on what is not immediately

immediately preſent, the mind reflects on the paſt, and foreſees future events, it reflects on itſelf and on its own operations, of this matter is totally incapable. The mind conceives that it is impoſſible the ſame thing ſhould be and not be at the ſame time, and this operation is abſolutely impoſſible to any ſubject compoſed of parts: if it be ſaid that the idea of what is, is in one part of the ſubject, and the idea of what is not, in another part of the ſubject, neither the one nor the other can pronounce the impoſſibility of their co-exiſtence; if it be thought that the idea of what is, and the idea of what is not, be in the ſame part of the ſubject, no reaſon can be aſſigned why that part ſhould poſſeſs theſe ideas excluding all others, moreover this part in which both ideas are ſuppoſed to exiſt, muſt be indiviſible or it would itſelf be compoſed of parts and the queſtion again recur; if it be aſſerted that theſe ideas are in every part of this compoſed ſubject, there will be as many judgments pronounced as parts in the ſubject, and after all there is but a ſimple and indiviſible Being which can pronounce the judgment.

This reaſoning which bears no reply, againſt which nothing can be offered, which does not carry abſurdity on the face of it, is applicable to every aſſertion whether affirmative or negative: in the affirmative the idea of the attribute is identified with that of the ſubject, and in the negative excluded from it, both theſe ideas muſt be in the ſame ſimple and indiviſible Being, or it would be impoſſible to pronounce the conſiſtency in the affirmative, or the inconſiſtency in the negative; thus for example ſuppoſing one man has a juſt idea of gold, no idea at all of ſilver, and another man an idea of ſilver, and no idea at all of gold, neither the one nor the other can pronounce this negative judgment, gold is not ſilver. The man who pronounces the judgment muſt have an idea of both the one and the other,

he

he compares theſe ideas and finds them inconſiſtent, and then declares that the one is not the other. Again the mind is unconfined in its operations, limited neither by time, nor ſpace, and frequently ranges in the regions of imaginary ſpace; from the knowledge of one thing it proceeds to that of another, it forms abſtract ideas, conſiders Beings in a ſtate of mere poſſibility, reaſons on Beings confeſſedly immaterial, virtue, vice, truth, falſhood, calculation of numbers. Of all theſe operations matter is totally incapable: neither motion nor reſt, ſituation nor figure, nor any poſſible operation of matter, will give an idea of truth, of mercy or benevolence, nor place matter itſelf in the regions of imaginary ſpace or inſtitute a mathematical demonſtration.

But ſays the Materialiſt we do not know all the properties of matter, the faculty of thinking may be amongſt theſe latent properties.

It is true we do not know all the properties of matter, but we know that amongſt the unknown properties of matter there are none which exclude theſe we know, none inconſiſtent with theſe we know, and of the properties, which we know there are ſome which exclude the poſſibility of thought, that is extenſion and figure.

But ſays the celebrated Philoſopher ſo dear to the Materialiſt, our conceptions do not confine omnipotence, we are not to conclude that matter does not think becauſe we do not conceive it poſſible. True! our conceptions are not the meaſure of almighty power. Many things are poſſible of which we can form no idea at all, and many things do exiſt which appear repugnant to our ſenſes. We do not conclude that matter cannot think, becauſe we do not conceive it poſſible that matter ſhould poſſeſs the faculty of thinking; but we conclude that matter does not poſſeſs this faculty,

faculty, becauſe we clearly and eaſily conceive that it is impoſſible it ſhould, and we know that this impoſſibility is founded in the nature of things; that a thinking pan or kettle is a ridiculous chimera, we know that the object of power is a Being, the component parts of which, or the conſtituent attributes, do not exclude each other, as a true falſhood, or a triangular circle, or a thinking pot.

Matter we conceive to be a ſolid ſubſtance compoſed of parts, the idea of vegetation or ſenſation is not included in the eſſential attributes of matter; yet we find matter capable of vegetation and ſenſation, why not of thought? For this ſimple reaſon, that the eſſential attributes of matter exclude the poſſibility of thought, not of vegetation or ſenſation, which may be effected by motion, and a different diſpoſition and configuration of the component parts of the ſenſitive or vegetating ſubſtance; both vegetation and ſenſation may be increaſed or diminiſhed, they may of courſe be modifications of a diviſible ſubject, the idea of truth, an affirmation or negation can neither be increaſed nor diminiſhed, it is eſſentially indiviſible and cannot exiſt but in an indiviſible ſubject.

As it is impoſſible for matter, any part or particle of matter to think or reaſon, and that, that thinking principle in man, which we call a ſoul, thinks, and reaſons, it neceſſarily follows that the ſoul is a ſpiritual ſubſtance. This truth founded on the moſt irreſiſtible reaſoning will appear evident to any man, who examines minutely its power of reflection, that is, when the ſoul forms a thought, and proceeds to examine it, and at times to examine its reflection on the thought, which it undertakes to examine, this power appears more wonderful when the ſoul reflects on herſelf, and examines her own operations, ſhe is then the ſubject of her own examination, an operation evidently ſpi-

ritual;

ritual, of which matter can by no poſſibility be, or be conceived capable.

As to the union of this ſpiritual ſubſtance with the body compoſed of matter, we know it exiſts, the manner in which this ſurpriſing union is formed we do not know. That the ſoul acts on the body and the body on the ſoul is equally certain; the principles on which their mutual operations depend as aſſigned by different Philoſophers are ſome abſolutely falſe, and others uncertain, this argues a defect in our underſtanding, but does not affect a truth, which is known by inconteſtible experience.

But in fine ſays the Materialiſt the ſouls of brutes are capable of thought, and yet compoſed of matter. To this laſt refuge of the Materialiſt the writer replies if it be true, as he pretends, that, that principle of action, or rather that paſſive principle, which he calls a ſoul in the brute, be capable of thought, it is not compoſed of matter; or if it be compoſed of matter it is not capable of thought: whatever ſyſtem be aſſumed to account for the appearance of reaſon in brutes, it is metaphyſically true, that ſimple and indiviſible thought cannot be a modification of any ſubject compoſed of parts, if therefore this active or paſſive principle in the brute thinks it is not matter, and if it be matter it does not think.

Some Philoſophers celebrated in the ſchools pretend that brutes are mere automatons, and reduce all their operations to mechaniſm. Though the writer does not believe this ſyſtem true, the poſſibility is incontrovertible: ſuch machines being evidently within the reach of infinite power and wiſdom. In the principles of theſe Philoſophers the Materialiſt's objection vaniſhes. If the brutes be mere machines ſet in motion by ſprings, whatever appearance of reaſon be in their operations there is neither thought nor reflection, theſe Philoſo-

pliers confirm their opinion by arguments drawn from the human body, which may be conſidered as an hydraulic machine, in which the powers of mechaniſm are wonderfully combined. In the human body there are innumerable latent ſprings, which are never called into action but by accident, it is by theſe dormant ſprings that, when a leg or an arm is taken off, a new communication between the arteries and veins is formed, for the conveyance of the blood; this is an effect of mechaniſm, totally independent on the will, why may not the brutes, ſay they, be compoſed of ſprings ſo contrived as by the impreſſion of external objects to produce all theſe operations, which we admire? To this may be added that the operations of all individuals of the ſame ſpecies are invariably the ſame. The young ſquirrel, that has not yet ſeen a winter, makes as ample a proviſion of nuts as the old. This ſameneſs in the operations of the young and the old ſhew the mechaniſm to be the ſame.

As to the inſtruction, of which ſome brutes are capable, it depends on the organization of the animal, which may be rendered more or leſs perfect by practice, not precept, of which the brute is incapable, if words be added, they are applied as ſound, which act on the animal's ſenſe of hearing, not as ſigns to convey ideas to its underſtanding, hence no general principles, no mathematical demonſtrations, no new inventions, in a word no intellectual operation is within the animal's reach, becauſe it poſſeſſes no intelligent faculty. The whole of the animal's knowledge is confined to its ſenſes, and the ſenſes are acted on by preſent objects, no concluſions drawn from principles, no retroſpect, no forethought.

Whether the animal be conſidered as an automaton, or poſſeſſed of ſome paſſive cognoſcent principle, it is manifeſt that a certain order, and appearance of reaſon muſt appear in its motions, becauſe it is under the immediate

immediate direction of ſovereign reaſon, and intended to fulfil ſome end ; thus an arrow though deſtitute of ſenſe and reaſon, paſſes with the utmoſt regularity, to the mark intended by the archer. The arrow, you will ſay, is ſubſervient to the eſtabliſhed laws of motion, does not change its own direction, not ſo the animal. True, but if you compare the limited power and reaſon of the archer, to omnipotence and omniſcience, and conceive that effects are always correſpondent to the power of action in their cauſes, you will find that the regularity in the flight of the arrow is more wonderful than the motions of the moſt cunning animal.

Man being compoſed of ſubſtances eſſentially different, and ſubſtantially united, the active and intelligent principle is, in many of its operations, dependent on the diſpoſition of the body, more particularly in the acquiſition of ideas, a great number of which are not attainable but through the medium of ſome one or other of the ſenſes, this dependence of the ſoul on the diſpoſition of the body furniſhes the Materialiſt another pretence. The ſoul, ſays he, is weak in the child, ſtrong in the man, it grows with the body, languiſhes and dies with it. The very dependence of the ſoul on the diſpoſition of the body, in many of its operations, from which the Materialiſt draws his objection ſolves the difficulty, becauſe it follows of neceſſity, that the operations of the ſoul, dependent on the diſpoſition of the body, muſt be more or leſs perfect according to that diſpoſition, that its knowledge muſt increaſe with its years, and that every derangement in the organization of the body, muſt produce a correſpondent derangement in the operations of the ſoul, but this mutual dependence does not ſhew that they are ſimilar ſubſtances, or that the active principle, in which there is no principle of diſſolution, may not exiſt after the union, by the deſtruction of the body, is diſſolved.

To

To conclude this article: there is not an operation of the mind, which does not argue its ſimplicity, which does not ſhew it to be an uncompoſed, indiviſible and active principle, it is not the eye that judges of colours, nor is it the ear that examines the nature of ſounds, all the ſenſes are inlets, and the ſame indiviſible Being ſees, hears, taſtes and ſmells. If this principle be ſuppoſed material how take in ſuch an immenſe quantity of objects at the ſame view? Where ſtow all the objects contained in the memory? How extend its reſearches in futurity? Where place the ideas of truth, of virtue, of vice, of diſhoneſty, which affect no ſenſe? How compare ideas and draw concluſions from fixed and eternal principles? Theſe operations of the human mind ſhew, in the ſtrongeſt light, the ignorance, abſurdity and impiety of the Materialiſt. It is a melancholy truth that ſuch monſters in human ſhape do exiſt amongſt us, and that the gratification of ſenſual appetites degrades a man ſo low as to deprive him of the light of reaſon.

As this intelligent Being, which we call a ſoul, is not ſelf-exiſtent, cannot receive an exiſtence from any Being equally imperfect and impotent, it argues the exiſtence of an omnipotent and eternal cauſe, on which it depends for its exiſtence and preſervation in that ſtate of exiſtence.

The ſoul of man, not being compoſed of jarring elements like the body, has no principle of diſſolution within it, it is therefore immortal of its own nature, and as it cannot give itſelf exiſtence, when in a ſtate of mere poſſibility, nor receive it from any other Being equally impotent, ſo, when placed in a ſtate of exiſtence, it cannot deprive itſelf of exiſtence, nor be deprived of it by any power inferior to that from which it holds exiſtence, it therefore cannot be deſtroyed but by annihilation.

That

That the ſoul muſt exiſt, when the union with the body is diſſolved, is evident from this, that in its moſt perfect operations it is independent on the body, that is, in reaſoning on univerſal principles, which though eternal and immutable cannot affect any one of its ſenſes, hence it follows that a ſeparation from the body only ſerves to perfect the ſoul, and as perfection and corruption are eſſentially oppoſite, what perfects cannot corrupt, or deſtroy, the ſoul therefore muſt exiſt when the union with the body is diſſolved, if not reduced to non-exiſtence by annihilation.

To pretend that the ſoul, immortal of its own nature, capable of greater perfections in its higheſt operations in a ſtate of ſeparation, than when united with the body, ſhould be deſtroyed by almighty power is raſh and extravagant. No reaſon can be aſſigned for this pretended annihilation, whilſt reaſons not ſimply plauſible but concluſive and incontrovertible ſhew the contrary.

In the firſt place the deſire of immortality is natural to man. It is univerſal, and has been ſo from the commencement; in vain does the Atheiſt, or the Materialiſt, pretend that this may be the effect of prejudice or education: he might as well pretend that the deſire of life or the means to ſupport it, is the effect of prejudice or education.

Prejudices are variable, ſo is education, and the opinions depending on them as variable as the principles, on which they depend; the deſire of immortality is invariable, as univerſal as the deſire of meat and drink; it is therefore founded in our nature, impreſſed on the ſoul by its author, conſequently it cannot be vain, if the author of nature, in whom veracity, wiſdom and power are infinite, be not ſuppoſed to ſport with his creatures, and amuſe himſelf with deceiving them, which ſurpaſſes abſurdity.

There

There are many who do not desire immortality. Perhaps there may be some impious, profligate, and unprincipled characters, who have nothing to expect but the punishment due to their crimes, to whom of course immortality is not desirable. There are men without noses, and some without eyes, does it follow that an eye or a nose is not natural to man? No! but that, through the interposition of some secondary causes, there are monsters in the physical world; in like manner if there be an Atheist, or a Materialist, who does not desire immortality, it only proves that there are monsters in the moral world, so absorbed in sensuality as to be deprived of the light of reason. The qualities natural to any species are not to be sought for in monsters, in which there must be either an excrescence, or a defect, but they are found in the more perfect individuals of the species. That this desire of immortality is deeply implanted in the minds of all good men was never denied even by the Atheist.

In the next place, the mind of man is unlimited in its desires, the more it knows, the more it desires to know, the greater its possessions the more it extends its views. One object attained is but an incentive to pursue another; it is therefore manifest that nothing short of infinitude can fill the capacity of the mind, and equally evident that infinitude is not attainable but by immortality, where truth is seen in its source, and fills the capacity of the understanding, and infinite excellence fixes the desires of the will, there being no other object which it can desire. This unlimited capacity, in the mind of man, shews that he has been intended for the possession of infinite excellence. Whence these terrors in the mind of the vicious or rather flagitious man? Whilst with impunity and horror he oppresses innocence, and increases his possessions with the spoils of the defenceless? And whence this secret satisfaction

in

in the ſoul of the juſt man, when he relieves the diſtreſs of his moſt inveterate enemy, forgetting in the day of his diſtreſs that he is an enemy, and remembering that he cannot ceaſe to be his brother? Does not that ſenſe of rectitude implanted in the mind of man, point out an immortality, in which the juſt man expects the reward of his virtue, and the oppreſſor of innocence and weakneſs fears the puniſhment of his crimes? But virtue ſays the Materialiſt is its own reward, the ſenſe of having done a virtuous act rewards the action. It is true the ſenſe of virtue ſoothes in affliction, and pleaſes in proſperity; but it is from the proſpect of futurity, in which that reward, which is here denied, will be obtained. Virtue without a reward either here or hereafter, either in fact, or in hope, though good in itſelf, is not the ſource of any thing that is good. Vice rewarded here, and having nothing to fear hereafter, is preferable; hence it follows that the Atheiſt, and Materialiſt muſt be a flagitious man or a fool; that any appearance of virtue in ſuch a character is mere hypocriſy, a maſk aſſumed to impoſe on the unwary.

Now let us ſuppoſe that virtue from its innate beauty, and the ſatisfaction which attends virtuous actions may, without any proſpect of immortality, be an inducement to practice virtue in ſome inſtances; will it in all poſſible conjunctures? And ſuppoſing it a reward in ſome inſtances will it in all? What is the reward of the virtuous man whoſe innocence is oppreſſed by power, his reputation ruined by calumny, his family degraded and reduced to beggary, and he himſelf dragged as a criminal to a gibbet? In this life he can have no reward, becauſe he is deprived of life; in a future he can have none, if we believe the Materialiſt.

And what is the puniſhment of a mercileſs Tyrant, who

who ſacrifices thouſands to his amuſement? Who, inſenſible to the cries of defenceleſs women and children, buries them in the ruins of the cities which his ambition levels with the ground? An immortality is indiſpenſably neceſſary to reward the unmerited and unrewarded ſufferings of the former, and to puniſh the ferocious cruelty of the latter.

It is therefore manifeſt that the ſoul, immortal of its own nature, will not be annihilated by the power of its Creator. Add to this that a creature does not attain its ultimate end until its natural deſires are ſatisfied, the ſoul of man naturally, and invincibly, deſires happineſs, and a perpetual continuation of happineſs. The author of human nature does not withdraw that, which perfects nature, that without which it cannot attain its ultimate end. The poſſibility of annihilation is indiſputable: the power which creates can annihilate; nothing leſs than infinite power can do either. The diſtance between non-exiſtence and exiſtence whether infinite or not, is manifeſtly inſuperable to any limited power, but that it is inconſiſtent with the preſent order of things to exerciſe this power is manifeſt from the reaſons already aſſigned and will appear more clearly in the courſe of the work.

If it be aſked why the ſoul being independent on the body in its higheſt operations, and more capable of exerciſing its intellectual faculties in a ſtate of ſeparation, has been united to the body? The reply is ſimple and ſatisfactory. In all that depends on the abſolute and ſovereign will of the Creator he acts according to the dictates of his wiſdom. Conjecture aſſigns two plauſible reaſons. The firſt that the ſoul united to the body, in its ſtruggles with Beings of an inferior order, may be prepared for a more noble end as gold is tried in the fire; and through this appears the goodneſs of its author, in not only giving man a being, but alſo

enabling

enabling him by his own efforts and the exercise of his faculties to attain a more exalted end, than that for which human nature seems intended. And the second, that the body itself elevated by its union with the soul, and purified by the practice of these virtues, of which it is the instrumental cause, may be placed in a more sublime situation, so that the soul may be to the body, what God is to the soul.

As it is impossible that a Being which is itself destitute of intelligence could give existence to intelligent Beings, from the existence of so many spirits in the intellectual world, that man must be ignorant indeed who does not see that there must be a primary cause sovereignly intelligent, a pure intellectual Being eminently possessed of all the powers and perfections, which it so bountifully, and abundantly bestows on its creatures. This primary cause is what in common language we call God, the first object of his will is his own infinite goodness: in this he sees all that is pleasing in his creatures, as it is natural for goodness to communicate itself to these he gave existence at the commencement of time, yet to shew his sovereign independence from eternity he was equally happy and glorious without them, their existence, or non existence, argues no change in him, who is eternal, and immutable, but in them, who are from the necessity of their being imperfect, subject to change. According to our limited mode of conception a sort of progress may be remarked in the love of God, his own excellence the first and principal object, the excellence and beauty of the universe as reduced to it, and the goodness of each particular object in reference to the whole, hence it is clear that what may appear to us a defect may be a perfection considered with respect to the whole, of which it is a part.

The excellence of God, to which nothing can be com-

pared, is a ſufficient reaſon for his loving himſelf; his goodneſs alſo is a ſufficient reaſon for creating the world; but a reaſon of mere convenience, not of neceſſity: for it is convenient and conſiſtent with ſovereign goodneſs to communicate itſelf in ſome meaſure, yet it is totally independent becauſe it is neither encreaſed nor diminiſhed by the goodneſs of its creatures.

Fear, hope, deſire, ſorrow, repentance, or any other paſſion, which argues a change in the ſubject, are inconſiſtent with the divine nature. Love is not; God loves himſelf and all his creatures, the beauty of the object attracts our will, the love of God is not attracted by the goodneſs of the object, it is efficient, not affective, it infuſes goodneſs and beauty in the object, and though the love of God to his creatures be one ſimple act identified with his eſſence, and incapable of encreaſe or diminution, from the greater or leſs excellence, which he communicates, it may be denominated greater, or leſs, in this ſenſe he does not love all his creatures equally. Some Philoſophers have taught that God from the neceſſity of his Being, is determined to create this world, and that a more, or leſs perfect, he could not create, this is perfectly impious, and hardly deſerves a refutation.

A chriſtian Philoſopher admitting the liberty of God to create, or not to create, pretends that of all poſſible ſyſtems, the preſent one is the moſt perfect, this opinion though not ſo impious as the former, is equally abſurd, as if the perfection of the whole, does not conſiſt in the perfection of it's component parts; and as if there be any one part of the viſible world, or even the intellectual world, at its ultimate point of perfection, ſo that omnipotence could not add one degree of perfection more to it.

The creation of a world more, or leſs, perfect, is an effect of choice, ſo that God is perfectly free to create or not

not to create, to create a world more or leſs perfect, God loves himſelf neceſſarily: it is impoſſible that ſovereign wiſdom ſhould not direct him to love ſovereign goodneſs, his creatures he loves becauſe he created them, not becauſe they are neceſſary to his happineſs, his exiſtence, his goodneſs, his ſanctity are independent on his creatures; on the contrary all his creatures depend on him. Moreover that liberty, which is enjoyed by many of his creatures, he muſt poſſeſs in a more eminent degree, elſe he could not communicate it. It may be ſaid that, the divine will, as the divine knowledge, being identified with the divine nature, God wills of neceſſity all that he wills, as he knows of neceſſity, all that he knows. The difference conſiſts in this, that the knowledge of objects, has a reference to the underſtanding, in which they are known, but the will has a reference to the objects as they are in themſelves.

Though the will of God be eternal, and immutable, and the efficient cauſe of all his creatures, it does not follow that his creatures ſhould exiſt from eternity, but that they ſhould exiſt in the ſucceſſive order, in which, by a free act of his will, he prediſpoſed them, nor does it follow that their exiſtence is neceſſary, but hypothetically, that is, in the ſuppoſition of God's determination to create them.

In God there is no paſſive indifference, nor is it neceſſary in us; an inſtant previous to action is indiſpenſably neceſſary to examine motives, and decide in conſequence. This inſtant is called the inſtant of election. God, whoſe knowledge is infinite, decides immediately, without any examination of motives, and his deciſion, or decree, is the exerciſe of the moſt perfect liberty, being an effect of active indifference; under no influence of any external cauſe, or preponderating motive capable of neceſſitating the will; his

goodneſs

goodneſs may be conſidered as an inducement to create a world, on which his own happineſs, the only object capable of influencing his will, is totally independent.

From this reaſoning it appears that the immutability of God's decrees is perfectly conſiſtent with his liberty; for the exerciſe of this liberty requires no paſſive indifference, no previous examination of motives, no ſucceeding change, in a word nothing which argues the ſhadow of inconſiſtency. A diſcuſſion of any kind, an enquiry into the efficacy of means, a deciſion contrary to a former deciſion, are inconſiſtent with God's immutability; all theſe are excluded from the exerciſe of his liberty.

God, being the firſt great and univerſal cauſe, it is manifeſt that all ſecondary cauſes are dependent on him in their actions, of courſe that nothing can happen contrary to his will, hence it does not follow that the actions of men are not free, and contingent; it only argues the efficacy of God's will in conſtituting all ſecondary cauſes ſo that they may produce their effects according to their nature, yet all ſubordinate to his ſupreme will. Arſenic poiſons, and bread nouriſhes. Theſe are blind cauſes, their effects are invariably the ſame; they are determined by the Author of their being, whoſe ſovereign will conſtitutes the nature of all his creatures. The man thinks, ſpeaks and acts free from co-action, from without, or neceſſity from within, but not liberated from his dependence on the primary, and univerſal cauſe; without the concurrence of which no ſecondary cauſe can act; hence it follows that, notwithſtanding the exiſtence of moral evil in this world, the will of God is always fulfilled. It is true, the malice, or deformity of moral evil, is contrary to the will of God; but the permiſſion of the act in which this deformity, or, if you will, this non-conformity with the law is found, is not contrary to his will: as the nature

of

of man is imperfect and defective, and that, in his wiſdom, he permits him to act according to his nature, and moreover as the reſult of this act, morally bad, is always directed by God to ſomething which is good, the permiſſion of the act is good, and conſiſtent with ſovereign goodneſs. From this permiſſion, or rather non-prevention of evil, it does not follow, that God is the cauſe of ſin either directly, or indirectly, or even by accident, as Philoſophers ſpeak. He is not the direct cauſe of ſin, becauſe he does not intend it, the proper uſe of liberty is intended by him, not the abuſe of it, not to ſay that a non-preventing cauſe, and more particularly a cauſe not obliged to prevent, was never thought an efficient cauſe of any act, either directly, or indirectly, or by accident, in a word the malice of any human act conſiſting in its non-conformity with ſome law, is a defect not an effect, it argues a deficient cauſe not an efficient one.

A queſtion of great importance comes next under conſideration, that is, if man be a free agent. However ſtrange it may appear that, an opinion abſurd in itſelf, contradicting the ſenſe of mankind, degrading man from the rank, which he holds in the order of Beings, annihilating vice and virtue, rendering rewards and puniſhments ineffectual, ſubverſive of ſocial order and deſtructive of all ſociety, ſhould be adopted, and publicly avowed, by men ſtiling themſelves Philoſophers, and pretending to correct old errors, and diſpel that illuſion, which deceived the world from the commencement, it is not the leſs true : our modern Philoſophers have diſcovered that man is a well regulated piece of clock-work ; an animated machine ; that all his thoughts, his ideas, his ſenſations, his words, his actions, are neceſſarily connected, and ſucceed each other in order, from the neceſſity of his Being, as the links in a chain or the movements in a clock.

Riſum teneatis amici.

It

It is irkſome to reaſon againſt nonſenſe, yet the conſequences of this opinion, publicly avowed, and obtruded on a deluded people, in a thouſand different forms, oblige us to examine the ſophiſtry of its abettors, and the different fallacies which with unparalelled effrontery they call concluſive reaſons.

It muſt be obſerved in the firſt place that external force produces co-action, an internal impulſe irreſiſtible, is called neceſſity, impulſe however ſtrong, if not irreſiſtible is an inducement to act, but not inconſiſtent with liberty. Co-action and neceſſity are incompatible with freedom of action, or determination.

Beings exiſt from the neceſſity of their nature, which cannot be ſuppoſed non-exiſtent. Men's actions, in the opinion under conſideration, are of that character, each ſucceeding act being neceſſarily connected with the preceding, ſo that, it is as neceſſary that the highwayman ſhould murder the innocent, and unſuſpecting traveller, at that preciſe point of time, and in that very place, where the murder is committed, as that there ſhould be an eclipſe of the Moon, at that preciſe time, and in that part of the expanſe, where the Earth's place in the ecliptic, is in the right line drawn from the Moon's place in its path to the Sun.

Beings are ſaid to be contingent, when they may be ſuppoſed to exiſt, or not, thus if man be a free agent, the highwayman might, without abſurdity, be ſuppoſed to abſtain from the murder. This ſuppoſition is ſo very natural that, a Judge, upon conviction, will order the highwayman for execution, thinking not only that he might, but that he ought to have abſtained from the murder.

If man has any object in view, if he purſues an end, the object may be attainable by one, or different means, if the end be attainable but by one mean, that mean is called neceſſary, not ſimply, as if the mean exiſted

exiſted from the neceſſity of its being, but it is neceſſary to the attainment of the end in view, thus a veſſel is neceſſary to croſs the ocean, if a man intends to do ſo, and food is neceſſary to ſupport life.

If the ſame end may be attained by different means, they are called uſeful, not neceſſary. A carriage is uſeful in a long journey.

There is alſo a twofold indifference, paſſive, and active, this paſſive indifference is peculiar to all inanimate Beings, which are indifferent to reſt or motion in any direction, and will remain in any ſtate, in which they are placed until removed by ſome external agent.

Active indifference is the reſult of reaſon, the foundation of liberty in man, and in all intellectual Beings.

This active indifference, or power of ſelf-determination, enables a man to purſue an object, or its oppoſite, or ceaſe from the purſuit; to aſſume or reject any mean, or chooſe between two, or more, means equal, or unequal.

Does man poſſeſs this power of ſelf determination? This active indifference? Is he maſter of his actions? Are they the reſult of choice, or the effect of irreſiſtible impulſe? The world was in poſſeſſion of believing man a free agent. What an effort of generoſity in our modern Philoſophers to attempt to undeceive it? But if the deception be natural to man, a link in the chain of his ideas, our Philoſophers have to lament his fate, leave him to his deſtiny, and thank their ſtars that they themſelves are but animated machines, monkeys of a larger ſize; and that they have the candor to acknowledge it, whether the world believe them or not.

The writer believes the modern Philoſopher a factitious monkey: his babbling reſembles the chattering of his brother brute, his pretenſions to honor, honeſty, integrity

integrity or any other human virtue is mere grimace; the factitious brute however surpasses the natural, in folly, impudence and vanity. Of this picture he must not complain; he knows that every impulse is irresistible, the writer is, therefore, irresistibly impelled to class these hitherto non-descripts called modern Philosophers amongst factitious monkeys.

God being infinitely perfect, and perfectly free, either from co-action or irresistible impulse, may create man a free agent: it is not impossible to omnipotence, nor inconsistent with goodness, nor repugnant to man's dependence on his maker; for though his desires are boundless, he cannot attain the different objects, which he desires without the concurrence of his maker, so that notwithstanding his liberty of determination and action, he is always in a state of dependence.

The majesty, the wisdom, the mercy, and the justice of God, are manifest in that indifference of action which man enjoys, his majesty in being served by choice, his mercy in forgiving offences on condition of penance, his justice in rewarding virtue, when vice is practicable, and punishing vice whilst virtue is possible, and his wisdom, in establishing moral laws, the observance of which constitutes true happiness here, and conducts to endless happiness hereafter.

It is in vain to pretend that mere spontaneity is sufficient to constitute liberty. If so a wolf in pursuit of prey would be a free agent, and his liberty increase with his hunger, because it is certain that his pursuit of prey is eager and spontaneous in proportion to his hunger.

And it is yet more ridiculous to pretend that external co-action alone destroys liberty. Irresistible impulse from within is evidently more inconsistent with it. Why so? Because the will cannot be forced by

by any external power: the body may be laid under any reſtraint but not the mind, whereas internal impulſe irreſiſtible reſtrains the mind, deprives her of the power of accepting or rejecting the object propoſed to the will, or of purſuing another at that time; hence appears the indiſpenſable neceſſity of active indifference in a free agent, that is, that the agent be not determined by any cauſe, either external, or internal, but determines itſelf according to election. This neceſſity of election argues the neceſſity of ſome previous knowledge of the object: the mind can neither deſire nor hate an object, of which it has no idea at all, the purſuit of ſuch an object, muſt be the effect of blind impetuoſity, or impulſe, not of choice.

Hence abſolute neceſſity deſtroys liberty of action, becauſe it is totally inconſiſtent with active indifference, as it determines the mind on purſuit of the object; with previous knowledge as it is implanted in our nature; and with choice or election, it leaves room for none.

Hypothetical neceſſity is reconcileable with free agency, thus a veſſel is neceſſary for me to croſs the Atlantic, but this neceſſity ſuppoſes my determination to croſs it, and a previous knowledge, diſcuſſion, and choice of the motives, which induced me to make the voyage.

The exerciſe of reaſon is abſolutely neceſſary to liberty: it is reaſon which directs the mind in the choice of motives, in the choice of means to attain an end, or in the choice of objects, which to purſue, or which to avoid; without reaſon there is no election, there is no liberty, nothing but blind inſtinct or natural and irreſiſtible impulſe. Hence fools and children are not accountable for their actions. Though the will be the ſubject of liberty, reaſon is the cauſe of it. Hence it follows that any thing not ſubject to the judgment of

reaſon, cannot be the object of liberty, as the deſire of happineſs in general, it is implanted in the mind of man, from this deſire of happineſs in general we purſue particular objects, which we think conducive to happineſs, in the choice of theſe objects, and in the choice of means to attain theſe objects, conſiſts the exerciſe of our liberty. The purſuit or averſion of any object pre-ſuppoſes a knowledge of the object, a diſcuſſion of motives, an election and conſequent determination, all which are neceſſary to conſtitute a free act of the will.

Motives however ſtrong are but inducements to act: they give no irreſiſtible impulſe; the mind from its innate activity is free to reject or re-conſider them; but if the mind ultimately determines to act in ſuch or ſuch a manner, in conſequence of ſuch or ſuch a motive, its active indifference with reſpect to that particular act of the will, no longer ſubſiſts, becauſe it has been exerciſed; the act itſelf is no longer indifferent to exiſt or not exiſt, becauſe it in fact exiſts; yet it is manifeſtly a free act, becauſe it is the effect of free and active determination, upon conſideration of motives, and choice, hence Philoſophers ſay that a man neceſſarily acts in conſequence of his laſt practical judgment, which is true, but it is a neceſſity induced by the exerciſe of his liberty, as it is impoſſible that he ſhould act and not act at the ſame time.

The aſſent of the underſtanding to certain truths, which are irreſiſtible, is not repugnant to liberty: it is true the mind cannot refuſe its aſſent to truths, which are evident on the expoſition; but the mind is under no neceſſity of contemplating theſe truths, the neceſſity of believing them, is therefore a conſequent neceſſity induced by an act of choice, in which the exerciſe of liberty conſiſts.

That the will of man is unreſtrained in its determinations

tions, either by external force, or internal impulſe, is the univerſal ſenſe of mankind if you except a few vain men, who to acquire a name, affect to believe the contrary of what their actions ſhew to be truth; the very jargon of theſe ſcribblers is the effect of liberty, and its greateſt abuſe.

If man be not maſter of his actions to what end have laws been eſtabliſhed in all countries and at all times? To what end propoſe rewards or puniſhments? Why praiſe the fortitude of the one, or deſpiſe the daſtardly cowardice of the other? Why erect a ſtatue to the deliverer of his country, or a gibbet for the betrayer? It is evident as the Sun at mid-day that no man deſerves reward, or puniſhment, for what he cannot poſſibly avoid.

To pretend that men's actions are under the influence of fate is a ridiculous abſurdity: fate is an empty ſound, it conveys no idea to the mind, to aſſign an imaginary Being, which has no exiſtence, as the director of man's will, ſurpaſſes folly. That the will of man is ſubject to the influence of the Stars is equally abſurd. Are the Stars intelligent? Do they direct the mind of man according to fixed or variable laws? In reaſoning on moral principles, on mathematical truths, on univerſal principles, on virtue, vice, &c. are we to conſult the relative poſitions of the Planets?

But ſays the Aſtrologer the influence of the Moon is manifeſt in the caſe of lunatics. Yes and in many other caſes too: its influence is great on all ſublunary bodies. It is not difficult to aſſign the reaſon. The attractive force of the Moon encreaſing, or decreaſing, in a certain proportion, as its diſtance from the Earth encreaſes or decreaſes, augments or diminiſhes the preſſure of the atmoſphere on the human body, as on all other ſublunary bodies, and thereby encreaſes or diminiſhes that derangement

rangement in the lunatic's frame, which is the cauſe of his lunacy, the effects of the Moon and of all other Planets on the atmoſphere and on the waters are ſubject to mathematical calculations. No doubt our pretended Philoſophers will begin to calculate the operations of the mind proportioned to theſe effects : the data are ſufficient for men accuſtomed to ſwallow all ſorts of abſurdity, or, if you will, worthy the attention of theſe men who are come to undeceive the human race, pardon the expreſſion, the *Baboon race*. Unfortunately certain events ſhew that the influence of the Planets is not invariable on the human mind : at the ſame inſtant a drunkard ſteps into the tavern, and a ſober man paſſes it unnoticed, the influence was not the ſame on both. No matter. That will only encreaſe the difficulty of calculation, and the glory of the modern Philoſopher will ſtill be greater.

The mind of man is conſcious of its liberty, the man who denies it, believes this truth as the writer does : he is convinced that when he turns his thoughts on any object, he may remove the object from his mind, and make ſome other a ſubject of conſideration, or continue to contemplate the former, when he walks, he knows he may ſit at his will, or continue to walk, and if he continues to walk, it is an effect of choice, or if he ſits, it is equally an effect of choice. It is true he cannot walk and ſit at the ſame time. Liberty does not require impoſſibilities, but it is enough that he walks or ſits at his option, to convince him that his determinations are free from reſtraint. It is in vain to reaſon with a man who does not admit a truth, of which he is conſcious.

It is true certain thoughts occur, for which we cannot account, and our ideas at times ſucceed each other without any ſort of connection. Images are propoſed to our imagination which we bear with reluctance, and from

from which we find it difficult to disengage our mind; but all this so far from being inconsistent with liberty shews that there is within us a power of action and determination uncontrouled. Why so? Because the virtuous man rejects these objects proposed to his imagination, with horror, regardless of the strong impressions made on animal nature. Whilst the intemperate sensualist pursues them with an eagerness, which approaches fury. The power therefore of rejecting or desiring such objects is free from restraint; this not only proves the liberty of man, but also the total independence of the soul on the body in its operations. For if the strongest impressions on the sensual appetite be not irresistible, it is manifest that the soul is mistress of her will and independent on the body.

Finally the object of desire is either real, or apparent good, and the object of aversion, is either real, or apparent evil, there is no object inferior to sovereign happiness, which may not excite desire, or aversion, which the will may not pursue, or relinquish, because there is none in which there is not some appearance of good, and some appearance of evil, no particular object therefore can irresistibly attract the will.

The man, who dreams, says the Materialist, is conscious of his liberty, why not the man who wakes? May not his life be a perpetual dream? Such nonsense shews the Materialist to be a dreamer. If it be true, as some Physicians pretend, that dreams are caused by a certain commotion in the brain from the irregular flowing of the animal spirits, and presenting ideas to the mind as if a real impression were made on the organs of sense, it is easy to conceive that the mind enjoys no liberty in its dreams, because there is no comparison of ideas, no previous knowledge of objects, no examination of motives, consequently no choice, no exercise of liberty. To pretend that man in his sober senses and active employments

employments is in the ſame ſtate as if he dreamed is an abſurdity beneath notice.

Nothing exiſts without a ſufficient reaſon, no effect without a cauſe, true, but the cauſe may be determined to act by ſome external power, as a ſtone gravitates according to the laws of motion, or the cauſe from innate activity determines itſelf, as a man walks, or ſits, at his option, any inducement is a ſufficient reaſon for either.

All ſecondary cauſes are dependent on the primary cauſe in their operations. That is admitted; but the primary cauſe directs ſecondary cauſes according to their nature, becauſe God preſerves and does not corrupt the nature of his creatures, hence as he has created man intelligent, an active and free agent, in the direction of his operations, he does not deprive him of that liberty of action, which is a privilege of human nature, the very characteriſtic which diſtinguiſhes him from the brute.

As man is not ſelf-exiſtent, he muſt depend on the ſame great cauſe which gave him an exiſtence for a continuation of that exiſtence. At the firſt inſtant of exiſtence he may be conſidered as merely paſſive, but nothing prevents him from exerciſing that activity, which he received with exiſtence in all ſucceeding inſtants: for whether his preſervation be conſidered as a continuation of the act of creation, or rather a manutention in received exiſtence, or ſimply a permiſſion to continue, it is certain, that he is not taken a ſecond time from a ſtate of non-exiſtence, and that being in exiſtence, he may exercise the natural powers which he poſſeſſes.

In children, and ſome ſuperannuated perſons reaſon appears weak, hence the Materialiſt imagines that, the operations of the ſoul are the effects of motion, with which active indifference is irreconcileable.

It is true the ſenſes are the inlets of moſt ſenſations, and many ideas, and any derangement in the organs of ſenſe muſt affect the ſoul in many of her operations, whilſt united with the body. In the child the organs are not ſufficiently formed to uſe them with efficacy, and in extreme old age they are decayed. Liberty is an inherent power of the ſoul, but as the exerciſe of this power requires a previous knowledge of objects, if through any defect in the organs, theſe objects are not repreſented, the exerciſe of the power muſt be ſuſpended, as in children or perſons inſane through age or infirmity.

A Philoſopher of note unable to explain the motions of the body ſubſervient to the will, or the impreſſions of the ſenſes on the mind, pretends that the ſoul is but the occaſional cauſe, and God the ſole mover. Thus for example the ſoul deſires to move the finger, and God gives it motion, in like manner an external object makes ſome impreſſion on the organs of ſenſe, and God produces in the ſoul a correſpondent ſenſation, if he had confined himſelf to ſay that the operations of the one or the other, were conſequences of the phyſical and perſonal union of the ſoul with the body, according to laws eſtabliſhed by the Creator, there would be nothing reprehenſible in his opinion. How this union is formed we do not know, it is not the only part of God's work which our underſtanding cannot reach, that it ſubſiſts we know, and that it may be diſſolved we will know.

Another Philoſopher unreſtrained in his opinions by divine authority, pretends that the ſoul and body both act independent; that a ſeries of movements ſucceed in the body correſpondent to a ſeries of ideas in the ſoul; to juſtify ſome appearance of free agency in the ſoul, of which we are all conſcious, he pretends that this correſpondence is pre-eſtabliſhed between the perceptions

ceptions of the mind, not its volitions, and the movements of the body, whereas the movements of the body in reality correſpond to the volitions and not the perceptions: for whatever ideas or images are repreſented to the mind, it is the volition, or order of the will which gives motion to the hand. To paſs in ſilence the abſurdity of ſuppoſing that the ſoul and body are ſo conſtituted, that, if the ſoul were in China and the body in Peru, the ſame perceptions would ſucceed in the one, and movements in the other, as in their preſent union.

In vain the Philoſopher has recourſe to the preſcience of God to foreſee the volitions of the ſoul, and to his omnipotence to form a correſpondent automaton, it is well known that both is poſſible, and equally well known that in his ſyſtem the ſoul in its volitions is confined to the motions pre-eſtabliſhed in the body, and no others, which is deſtructive of its liberty. It is quite otherwiſe with the preſcience of God: for though the ſoul will not form any other volition, but that which is foreſeen, the poſſibility, and power of forming any other ſubſiſts, and is totally unreſtrained.

However incorrect the opinions of theſe Philoſophers, they unanimouſly admit the liberty of man, and endeavor to reconcile it with their principles, they are not to be numbered with Atheiſts or Materialiſts.

The power of God comes next under conſideration, it is infinite being unreſtrained by any external cauſe, God being totally independent, nor can it be circumſcribed by God himſelf, as he has not given himſelf exiſtence, nor perfection, it is identified with his eſſence, becauſe there is nothing in God which is not, it is therefore the principle, not of action, which is not diſtinguiſhed from power in God, but of effects, and theſe effects not being infinite, ſhew the liberty of God in all his works, for any effect from the neceſſity of nature,

nature, is correſpondent to the power of the agent, thus a ſtone falls with all its weight, a man begets another and no other Being.

Within the ſphere of omnipotence are all theſe Beings which do not involve a contradiction, that is, whoſe conſtituent parts or attributes are not incompatible. Beings compoſed of attributes which exclude each other can have no exiſtence, they are not the objects of power.

The immenſity, or omnipreſcence, of God argues no ſpiritual extenſion in him, for where there is extenſion, there muſt be a plurality of parts, which is repugnant to the perfect ſimplicity of the Divine Nature. God is in all things and places, by his power: all things are ſubject to it; by his preſence: all things are open to his view; and by his eſſence: from him all created Beings have an exiſtence. God is preſent to all things, not as a part of their eſſence, nor as an accident, but as the agent is preſent to the ſubject, on which it acts, and as all things have from him an exiſtence, and the continuation of that exiſtence than which nothing is more intimate to any Being, hence it follows that God is intimately preſent to all Beings whilſt they do exiſt. "In him we live, we move, and are."

The arguments adduced in favor of the opinion that, the preſent world is of all poſſible ſyſtems the moſt perfect, hardly deſerve refutation, as it is manifeſtly injurious to the power, the wiſdom and the goodneſs of God, and totally deſtructive of the divine liberty.

It is admitted by the partizans of this abſurd opinion, that the power of God is not exhauſted by the production of this preſent world, or the perfection of its component parts. Why confine the wiſdom of God to this order in preference to all others? Does God not know the extent of his power? Or to ſpeak more correctly does he not know that his power is infinite, that no

creature which he has produced, is at the ultimate point of perfection, to which his infinite power could not add one degree of perfection more? Why pretend that his wiſdom could not prefer a ſyſtem, in which all the component parts, would receive an additional degree of accidental perfection? Does not the perfections of the whole reſult from the relative perfections of all its parts? In a word if his power, his wiſdom and his goodneſs be confined to the preſent ſyſtem, neither the one nor the other is infinite, for the preſent ſyſtem has its limits; and the man who limits the power or wiſdom of God is not far remote from an Atheiſt.

We come next to examine theſe attributes of the Divinity, which are called relative by Philoſophers, becauſe they import, or rather indicate, a ſort of relation to its creatures; the firſt of theſe is the creation, or that act of the divine will, which gives exiſtence, this act of omnipotence is in every ſenſe impoſſible, and incommunicable to any created Being: in the order of agents and actions, the moſt excellent action is confined to the moſt excellent agent, that action, which gives exiſtence is of all others the moſt excellent, becauſe it is the firſt, it is therefore confined to the firſt, and moſt univerſal cauſe, the Divinity.

Nor can any creature be aſſumed as an inſtrumental cauſe, for all inſtruments diſpoſe by that action, which is proper to them, the ſubject matter, for the action of the principal cauſe: in the creation of any Being there is no pre-exiſtent matter, no ſubject, which the inſtrument can diſpoſe, and though all creatures are limited, yet the production of any one of them requires unlimited power, a power incommunicable to any creature.

Though we cannot repreſent to our imagination a Being transferred from a ſtate of mere poſſibility to a ſtate of exiſtence; yet as our reaſon is convinced that

all

all the Beings, which now exiſt in this viſible world, are ſubject to change, and continually changing, we are forced to conclude that they are not ſelf-exiſtent, that they muſt therefore have been educed by a cauſe ſelf-exiſtent, and all-powerful, from a ſtate of non-exiſtence. We are alſo forced to conclude that, God in the formation of the world did not diſpoſe any pre-exiſtent matter, which he himſelf had not created, for as all matter is manifeſtly created, if there had been any pre-exiſtent matter not created by God, it muſt have been by ſome other Being of ſuperior power, that power which furniſhes the matter is evidently ſuperior to that which diſpoſes it; to admit a power ſuperior to omnipotence is ridiculous.

The laws of motion, to which all bodies are ſubject, and which they invariably obſerve, ſhew a ſuperintendant power, which is implicitly obeyed, in other words a Providence, which conducts this viſible world. From certain diſorders which happen, and events, which ſeem inconſiſtent with our notions of a ſuperintending power, ſome Philoſophers pretend to conclude that Providence does not extend to human actions, though theſe very diſorders, and events, from which they pretend to draw the concluſion, are concluſive evidence of the contrary: for order is an effect of wiſdom and power, and if order be not eſtabliſhed, there can be no diſorder. To paſs unnnoticed the extravagance of ſuppoſing a God all-bountiful, all-wiſe and all-powerful, neglecting that part of his works, from which he has a right to expect his tribute of gratitude, and external glory, whilſt a man who plants an orchard, or even a tree, without any object in view and neglects it muſt be thought an idiot.

The cauſes of Providence extend to the moſt minute parts of the creation, for the beauty and order of the whole reſults from the beauty and order of all its parts.

To

To obviate a difficulty, which is drawn from the proſperity of the wicked, and adverſity of the juſt, from the oppreſſion of innocence and the haughty inſolence of power, it is ſufficient to remark that if all crimes were immediately puniſhed there would be no room for repentance, none for the exerciſe of clemency and mercy, the deſtruction of a great majority of the human ſpecies would be inſtantaneous. It is true great crimes, are ſometimes puniſhed immediately to terrify others, and if virtue does not immediately obtain its reward, it will in due time, patience and perſeverance enhance the merit of all other virtues.

God in his providence directs all his creatutes to their ultimate end immediately, and each creature to its immediate end, but in the execution of this direction the intervention of ſecondary cauſes is admiſſible, each acting according to its nature, yet ſo as not to diſturb or derange the plan propoſed by God as *ſupreme proviſor*, and though all his creatures are immediately ſubject to God's providence, intelligent Beings are more particularly the objects of his care, they are the only ſpectators of his works, the only creatures capable of knowing and loving him, and as he is himſelf the laſt end of all his creatures they alone can attain this end, it is therefore manifeſt that they are the firſt objects of his care; hence it follows that intelligent Beings are under the direction of Providence, not only for the good of the ſpecies, but alſo for the good of the individual, whereas of all other creatures the individuals are directed to the good of the ſpecies. Hence alſo it appears that the number of individuals of any ſpecies, except the human, though known to God as nothing is unknown to him, is not immediately intended for the individuals but for the ſupport and propagation of the ſpecies.

As God, in the production of many effects, admits

the

the intervention of ſecondary cauſes acting according to their nature, order requires that inferior Beings ſhould be ſubject to the direction of ſuperior, non-intelligent to intellectual, and as amongſt intellectual Beings ſome are ſuperior to others, order requires that the more noble ſhould direct ; yet whatever effects are produced by ſecondary cauſes may at times be produced by God immediately, as at the creation all effects were produced by the Divine Power without the intervention of any ſecondary cauſe ; and the powers of all cauſes are from him, nor is the production of any effect without the intervention of a ſecondary cauſe, a diſturbance of the eſtabliſhed order: becauſe even that is ſubject to order, and within the ſphere of his providence. Moreover the order eſtabliſhed in the production of effects by ſecondary cauſes is not abſolutely invariable, but ſubject to interruptions through the interference of other cauſes, as when a child is born without hands or with ſix fingers, if therefore the eſtabliſhed order may be interrupted by the interference of ſecondary cauſes, it may by the primary cauſe, this ſometimes happens for the manifeſtation of God's glory ; and to ſhew that the order, which now ſubſiſts was an effect of choice, not of neceſſity. Effects produced by the Divine Power without the intervention of ſecondary cauſes, though not in the common courſe of nature, are not contrary to nature : for all ſecondary cauſes are but the inſtruments of Divine Power, and the nature of all Beings is totally dependent on the Divine Will. The univerſe therefore, and all the Beings which compoſe it, is a piece of mechaniſm, and God the artiſt, however well finiſhed the piece may appear, the artiſt may yet make changes according to his will. A prodigy therefore though not in the common courſe of nature, as known to us, is perfectly natural, becauſe it is according to the diſ-

poſition

poſition of the Divine Will which determines the nature of all things.

Though God in his providence be infallible, and that will certainly happen which he has ordered, all cauſes whatſoever being within the ſphere of his providence, yet the infallibility of his providence impoſes no neceſſity on the determinations of man's will, becauſe his providence infinitely perfect diſpoſes not only all events, but alſo the manner in which theſe events will happen; neceſſarily, if the cauſes be under any natural neceſſity, as an eclipſe of the Moon upon paſſing through the ſhadow of the Earth, or contingently, when the cauſes producing ſuch an effect are free agents, as the late French Revolution. In this appears the boundleſs power, and infinite wiſdom of God, that permitting a thouſand free and concurring cauſes to act according to their nature, and impoſing no neceſſity upon any one of them, he yet directs them all ſo as to produce infallibly that event, which is pre-diſpoſed in the order of his providence.

Though it may appear difficult to reconcile the infallibility of Providence with the free agency of man, yet, if it be conſidered, that there is no created object of man's purſuits, which has not its beauties and deformities, the difficulty will vaniſh. May not the deformities of the object be ſtrongly impreſſed on the mind and deter from the purſuit? Or may not the beauties of the object be ſo expoſed as infallibly to attract the notice? Do we not every day ſee the effects of human perſuaſion? Yet what man in his reaſon pretends that an Orator, who obtains his ſuit impoſes any neceſſity on the minds of an audience? But this you will ſay would make the infallibility of God's providence dependent on the will of man. No. But on its own infinite perfection; for it does not depend on the mind of man to ſee all the beauties or deformities of

the

the object, if they be not impreſſed on it by that all powerful agent, who directs the wills of all men without neceſſity, or coercion to his own views. "*Pertingens* "*a fine uſque in finem fortiter and ſuaviter omnia diſponens.*"

Hence it appears manifeſtly inconſiſtent with God's providence that man's liberty ſhould be deſtroyed, or even impeded, as the diſtinguiſhing characteriſtic of Providence is to preſerve, and not to corrupt the nature of his creatures; hence it appears alſo that the permiſſion of moral evil, or phyſical corruption is conſiſtent with Providence, becauſe in the execution of its decrees it makes uſe of ſecondary cauſes acting according to their nature; all free agents may uſe, or abuſe, their natural liberty; in the abuſe conſiſts moral evil. All material cauſes being compoſed of parts, are from their nature ſubject to diſſolution, and corruption, to ſay all in a word, God is the author of all that is good; evil he neither produces, ſuggeſts nor countenances; but from evil he always draws good and directs the reſult to the accompliſhment of his own views.

The motion of the Heavenly Bodies, and the communication of motion from one ſublunary body to another, is ſuch concluſive evidence of the inceſſant vigilance of Providence, and of the attention of a God, all-wiſe, and powerful to the preſervation of his creatures, that even to doubt it, argues the moſt ſtupid ignorance or obſtinate perverſeneſs.

The Planets, inert matter, move in their orbits with the utmoſt regularity; if any body in motion ſtrikes another either at reſt or in motion, the body which ſtrikes communicates a part of its motion to the other, proportioned to its maſs with mathematical preciſion. It therefore implicitly obeys the power which directs it.

Does this inviſible power which preſerves order in the univerſe, and by inceſſant action prevents confuſion, preſerve its creatures alſo in a ſtate of exiſtence, ſo that

if

if the upholding hand of infinite power be ſuppoſed withdrawn, but for an inſtant, the univerſe would ceaſe to exiſt? Yes, the ſame power which gives exiſtence, continues to preſerve it, and that Being which is originially from nothing, without a continuation of that action which gave it exiſtence would return to its primitive ſtate. It is true a ſpiritual ſubſtance has no internal principle of diſſolution; but it is equally true that as it did not give itſelf exiſtence, it cannot continue in its exiſtence, becauſe it cannot without abſurdity be ſuppoſed independent at any inſtant of its duration, it is therefore as dependent on the creating power for the continuation as for the commencement of exiſtence.

It is manifeſt that the ſame power, which creates, can annihilate, and as the goodneſs and wiſdom of God is totally independent on his creatures, he may, at his will, either continue, or ceaſe to continue them in exiſtence; yet as the power, the goodneſs and wiſdom of God appears more evidently from the preſervation, than from the deſtruction of his creatures it is certain that he will not annihilate any one of theſe Beings, to which he has given an exiſtence.

His dominion over all his creatures is abſolute, and inalienable: from him they have not only that they exiſt, but that they do not ceaſe to exiſt. All irrational creatures implicitly obey, and purſue that path, which in his wiſdom he has traced for them, intelligent Beings abuſing that liberty of determination, and action, which diſtinguiſhes them from the irrational part of the creation, ſeem to diſobey, yet even theſe are reduced to the moſt perfect obedience: in all his precepts there is an alternative, either expreſſed or implied, obedience to the precept is expected from the intelligent creature, if refuſed the alternative depending on the abſolute will of the Creator will moſt certainly take effect.

We

We have now taken a curſory view of the perfections of God as known to us by the light of reaſon, and ſhewn the abſolute dependence of all his creatures on his bounty, not only for their exiſtence, but for the continuation of their exiſtence. Of his creatures ſome are inanimate, ſome, though animated, irrational, theſe have their places determined, their paths traced, from which, they neither do, nor can depart, being incapable of choice and blindly obedient to impulſe, intelligent creatures bleſſed with the light of reaſon are alone capable of acknowledging the obligation, and paying a voluntary homage to their Creator, to them laws are given; rewards promiſed to obedience, and diſobedience threatened with puniſhment. Amongſt them the terms *virtue* and *vice* are heard and underſtood, to feed the hungry was thought a virtuous act by the ſimplicity of our anceſtors, and to oppreſs innocence by power, or ruin reputation by calumny, was conſidered not ſimply a vicious act but an atrocious crime. Thanks to the new fangled philoſophy of modern ſcribblers theſe notions are grown obſolete: theſe pretended teachers of mankind gravely tell us that there is no eſſential difference between virtue and vice. That is in other terms. Reaſon qualifies the murder of an innocent, and loving parent, *a virtuous act*, as laudable as the defence of innocence againſt oppreſſion. Againſt abſurd extravaganee, or ſhameleſs impudence all reaſoning is vain. And the man who believes, or pretends to believe ſuch diſguſting nonſenſe is incapable of liſtening to reaſon.

To act according to the dictates of unprejudiced reaſon is perfectly conſiſtent with human nature: for, ſince man is a rational creature, to act according to the dictates of reaſon is anſwering the end of his creation, it is therefore conſiſtent with his nature; if, on the contrary, his actions be inconſiſtent with the dic-

tates of reaſon, he does not anſwer the end of his creation, he ſtrays from the path, which has been traced, and ſtands accountable to the Author of his Being for the perverſion and abuſe of the moſt excellent of his gifts, hence it muſt be inferred that virtue is conſonant to the nature of man, and vice repugnant to it, yet as all moral virtues are habits conſonant to reaſon acquired by a repetition of virtuous acts, virtue is not implanted in the nature of man, though the capacity of being virtuous is: this reaſoning applies with equal force to vice. Man is not born vicious, but the capacity of acquiring vicious habits is manifeſtly implanted in that ſenſuality, to which from its union with the body, the ſoul of man is naturally addicted.

Is man obliged to worſhip his God in ſpirit and truth? Is he indiſpenſably obliged to pay him internal reverence and external homage? The anſwer to this queſtion ſeems extremely ſimple, ſomething is due from man to that God, from whom he has received an exiſtence, and all that is neceſſary to ſupport that exiſtence, and on whoſe almighty power he depends for a continuation of that exiſtence. This truth is founded on the firſt principles of common ſenſe. The leaſt poſſible payment is an acknowledgment of the debt: man is therefore obliged to acknowledge him for his Creator, his conſervator, and his benefactor. And as God is good, and the fountain of all goodneſs, he is the great object of man's love, which can have no other object but either real or apparent good, to prefer any limited object to infinite goodneſs is inconſiſtent with reaſon, a love of preference is therefore indiſpenſably neceſſary, and, as he is truth itſelf, incapable of deception, or deceit, if he propoſes any truth, though it may tranſcend the ſphere of our limited underſtanding, we are ſtrictly obliged to believe it; but we are alſo obliged to enquire if, what is propoſed as truth, be revealed by him,

him, we thus confine our reaſon to its proper object: for to enquire, if what is revealed by God, be truth, or not, ſurpaſſes impudence. Hence it appears that faith is an eſſential part of that homage which man owes his God.

That man, if his actions be conſiſtent with the dictates of right reaſon, has a right to expect a reward from ſovereign power and infinite goodneſs, is indiſputable; and if his actions be inconſiſtent with reaſon, that he may juſtly fear chaſtiſement, from ſupreme juſtice is equally certain.

Beſides the internal reſpect, reverence and love which a man owes his God, he is obliged to pay external homage: becauſe man is compoſed of ſoul and body, the homage which he pays muſt be correſpondent to the nature of his Being, that is, it muſt be compoſed of the internal act of reverence within the ſoul, and the external act of the body, which ſignifies it, that it may not be ſimply the homage of the ſoul, nor ſimply of the body, but the homage of the man. To confine the divine worſhip merely to the internal act is to miſtake the nature of man, and alſo the nature of the homage, which he owes to his Creator as a man; becauſe God is a Spirit he muſt be adored in ſpirit, and becauſe he is truth itſelf, and ſanctity, no mixture of falſhood is admiſſible, nothing inconſiſtent with purity, nothing unworthy his majeſty: the external homage muſt be expreſſive and ſignificative of that internal reſpect, and reverence, which a man has for his God, as a Being infinitely perfect, pure and holy, it muſt, therefore, exclude every thing which is inconſiſtent with truth and ſanctity. Hence appears not only the abſurdity and extravagance, but the abominable impiety of the Heathen rites, of the Mahometan, and of ſeveral ſects, who perverted the Chriſtian worſhip by rites correſpondent to theſe opinions,

opinions, which flattered their pride or ſenſuality.

That there are certain human actions laudable in their own nature, and others reprehenſible, independently on all poſitive laws, was never denied but by the moſt corrupt and impious amongſt the Heathens. From theſe our modern Philoſophers have borrowed that nonſenſical jargon, which they call demonſtration, of an opinion the moſt extravagant that ever inſulted the public ear, to wit, that vice and virtue, right and wrong, are totally dependent on human laws; that no action conſidered in itſelf previous to ſome human law which forbids it, is wrong.

Nor is any action right if not ordered. What! theſe actions which tend to the public good, and public ſafety, would not be right if a malicious Tyrant forbid them! and actions evidently deſtructive of ſociety would be right if ordered by him! it is not in the power of any Legiſlature to make that which is juſt and laudable in itſelf, and advantageous to the public, diſadvantageous to it, or to make that which is ſubverſive of ſociety, uſeful to it. A law to order all mothers' to deſtroy their offspring would ſhew the malice of the Legiſlator; but would not make the act lawful, and if any man be ſo loſt to ſhame or ſo impudently obſtinate as to deny this truth, it is uſeleſs to reaſon with him.

As the nature of all the different ſpecies, which form the univerſe is determined, the actions conſiſtent with the nature of each ſpecies, are alſo determined, thus it is natural for a horſe to carry burthens, and a bird to fly. A flying horſe or a bird carrying burthens is unnatural. Hence ſince man is poſſeſſed of reaſon, it is natural that he ſhould act according to the dictates of reaſon. And ſince order requires that the inferior Being ſhould be directed by the ſuperior, it is manifeſt that all man's

ſenſes

ſenſes are to be directed by reaſon if reaſon be not thought inferior to one or other of the ſenſes, which is worſe than epicureiſm; hence it follows that intoxication, the immoderate uſe of food, the gratification of any ſenſual appetite, which diſturbs the free exerciſe of reaſon, is by nature forbidden independently on all human laws. Moreover, all that depends on mere human laws, on prejudices of education, or different inſtitutions are ſubject to change, and are in fact different in different countries, according to the difference of the prevailing opinions, but there are certain fixed principles ſubject to no variation, they are and have been the ſame in all times and places; theſe are of courſe implanted in our nature; nor is this ſpeculative principle, the whole is greater than any of its parts, more evident than this moral principle, do not to another what you would think injurious to yourſelf. It is true the mind of man abſorbed in ſenſual pleaſures, blinded by paſſion or prejudice, may miſtake and frequently does the diſtant conſequences and ſometimes the more immediate conſequences, which are drawn from firſt principles. Hence the Indian, knowing that he is obliged to love his friend, thinks it lawful to hate his enemy, on a principle of retaliation, and to expreſs his hatred the more ſtrongly, if he takes a priſoner, will exerciſe on him the moſt wanton cruelty, hence alſo ſome of them put their aged and helpleſs parents to death through a miſtaken principle of commiſeration. The application of general principles to particular circumſtances is ſometimes difficult; to evade this difficulty the great bulk of mankind think themſelves authoriſed to follow the example of others, hence the moſt abſurd cuſtoms have been introduced and continued for ages, the abſurdity of theſe cuſtoms does not argue the want of reaſon in the men, but their indolence and inattention to the voice of reaſon. Thus for example all

men

men know that ſome Being ſuperior to man exiſts, and think it neceſſary to ſerve him. The Heathens not conceiving it poſſible that any one Being was ſufficiently wiſe and powerful to frame and direct the univerſe parcelled it out amongſt Deities: a multiplicity once introduced, flattery added every Potentate to the number; leaſt theſe pretended Divinities ſhould be too ſevere, they were painted by their makers ſubject to all the vices, for which they themſelves were remarkable; hence, the moſt ſhameleſs paſſions had their patrons amongſt the Gods. The general principle was ſtrictly true, that there is a Being ſuperior to man, to whom homage is due, but the application of this principle was deteſtable; it was made by paſſion without conſulting reaſon.

In the like manner even Philoſophers and Legiſlators frequently diſagree in opinions, which are not immediate conſequences of intuitive principles, but they never taught that good was to be avoided, and evil purſued, though evil under the appearnce of good has been more than once propoſed.

To pretend that men are by nature inimical to each other, from different cauſes, is to inſult mankind, an offence againſt the human race, which only demonſtrates the unparallelled malignity of the man who dares to make uſe of ſuch an impudent aſſertion. Men, ſo far from hating each other, are formed by nature to love each other, they are formed for ſociety and cannot ſubſiſt without it: the wants of the infantine, infirm, and aged portions of the human ſpecies cannot be ſupplied without the cares of ſociety. That all men have formerly lived without any bond of ſociety like beaſts in the woods, and that they have been gradually formed into civil ſocieties, is a wild unfounded conjecture, contradicted by experience: we have known ſome men who from civilized ſociety transferred to uncivi-

lized

lized regions, they themſelves and their deſcendants became Savages; but we know of no Savage nation who without the influence of religion planted by the labors and ſufferings of its miniſters have become civilized.

As reaſon is natural to man, and the dictates of reaſon conſtituting what is called the natural law, or in other words man's immediate rule of action, the author of man's Being muſt be the author of the natural law, it is not neceſſary to publiſh this law either by word or writing, becauſe it is implanted in human nature, and as neceſſary for the ſupport of the intelligent world, as the laws of motion to the continuance of that order, and harmony, which exiſts in the phyſical world; a tranſgreſſion therefore of the natural law is manifeſtly an offence againſt its author.

The natural law in its firſt principles is immutable, it commands nothing but what is eſſentially good, and forbids nothing which is not eſſentially bad; in its more remote conſequences, circumſtances may render it ſubject to variation, thus though it be forbidden to kill, it is lawful for the public Magiſtrate to put a criminal to death. But it is never lawful, nor can it, by any change of circumſtances become lawful *to decline from good and do evil.*

Remote conſequences of the natural law are not known to all immediately, the firſt principles are, and cannot be effaced but by the extinction of reaſon. The application of theſe principles to particular caſes is ſometimes defective: thus the Indian knows that good is to be done, and evil avoided, he thinks it juſt to kill his aged and infirm father. The principle he knows but blindly miſapplies it

As it is natural for man to act according to the dictates of reaſon, all virtues as ſuch, are according to the natural law, and all vices againſt it. The former are

acts

acts of obedience to the Author of Nature, laudable in themſelves; the latter acts of diſobedience, reprehenſible, and conſequently inductive of puniſhment.

Is God the avenger of crimes? The queſtion is extremely ſimple: common ſenſe anſwers in the affirmative.

If he be the avenger of crimes, when does he exerciſe his vindictive juſtice? Sometimes in this life, more frequently and effectually in the next.

Many of the Heathen Philoſophers, and all theſe impious writers, who now aſſume the title, confine man's happineſs to the preſent life. They diſagree as to the conſtituent elements of happineſs. Some of the Heathens placing it in the purſuit of virtue, others in the gratification of the ſenſes, theſe and their followers, the modern ſquad, are juſtly called hogs of Epicurus's ſtye. The Stoics thought cold inſenſibility productive of true happineſs. It can hardly be denied that, the exerciſe of virtue contributes to private and public advantage: the virtuous man enjoys a peace of mind free from the terrors of conſcience, which invade the wicked man, ſometimes in the midſt of riot and tumult, and at all times in the ſilence of ſolitude: for as virtue is according to nature, and vice againſt it, nature approves the one, and cenſures the other; it is therefore as impoſſible for a man to free himſelf from a remorſe of conſcience as it is to diveſt himſelf of human nature. Virtue therefore contributes to private happineſs and vice deſtroys it.

That the exerciſe of virtue contributes to the public welfare and tranquility, muſt be admitted, if it be not thought that, highwaymen, traitors and murderers are to be conſtituted Judges, that men deſtitute of prudence, of juſtice and equity, are to be appointed Governors, that drunkards, profligates and ſpendthrifs are to poſſeſs all places of truſt and confidence. That man's underſtanding

underſtanding must be horribly perverted, who thinks it; and he muſt ſurpaſs the demon in impudence who dares to aſſert it. There are ſome ſo barefaced as to pretend that the vices of individuals are uſeful to the community; it is true the intemperance of the ſpend-thrift enriches the keeper of the brothel, and the hounds and horſes of the fox-hunter, enhance the value of the farmer's grain, but it is equally true that they withdraw from the common ſtock the induſtry of ſo many idle hands, whilſt they conſume a double portion of the fruits of the earth: on the principles of theſe wild ſpeculatiſts death and diſeaſe are beneficial to ſociety: death, brings money to the heir, and ſickneſs, to the phyſician.

Though the exerciſe of virtue contributes much to happineſs, it neither does, nor can, make the man truly happy in this life. True happineſs excludes all anxiety, pain, ſickneſs and death, and ſatisfies man's deſires to their fulleſt extent. The moſt virtuous man is ſubject to pain, to ſickneſs, to death, his deſires of full and permanent happineſs neither are nor can be ſatisfied in this life. Moreover we frequently ſee virtuous men in the moſt abject ſtate, their innocence oppreſſed by power, their reputation blaſted by calumny, they themſelves the objects of deriſion, and though a conſciouſneſs of rectitude may alleviate their ſorrows, it cannot make them happy. Stoic inſenſibility is an imaginary quality, which is not in human nature. The reward of virtue is, therefore, neither to be obtained, nor expected in this life; nor is vice puniſhed in proportion to its malice: the hypocrite is, of all vicious men, confeſſedly the moſt vicious: under the maſk of virtue he deceives ſimplicity, ſeduces innocence, oppreſſes weakneſs, ſupplants and excludes men of real merit, obtains preferment, honors, rewards and applauſe. In what appears the puniſhment of his crimes? He is tor-

tured by his conſcience. True, the terrors of his conſcience diminiſh his felicity, perhaps annul it ; but it is not leſs true that, the wicked man has a malignant ſatisfaction, in the ſucceſs of his projects, that he enjoys a diabolical pleaſure in ſacrificing innocence to his private views, of courſe, that to diminiſh his happineſs by the feeble voice of conſcience is not a puniſhment proportioned to his crimes.

Hence it appears that, in the preſent life, the virtuous man cannot be truly, and fully happy, nor the vicious man truly unhappy: for as true happineſs excludes all anxiety and pain, true miſery excludes all comfort and hope. The moſt wicked man though reduced to the laſt ſtage of miſery is not quite bereft of hopes, for death he thinks, at leaſt, will deliver him from his preſent miſery.

Theſe principles evident on the expoſition, ſhew that virtue cannot have its due reward, nor vice its due puniſhment in this preſent life. There is no true happineſs without, at leaſt, the fear, or rather certainty of its ceſſation, nor miſery without ſome ray of comfort or hope of alleviation.

If it be true that virtue is ſeldom rewarded in this life, and never according to merit, and alſo true, that vice frequently eſcapes puniſhment, and is never puniſhed in proportion to its malice, it follows of courſe that, the reward of the one, and the puniſhment of the other is to be referred to a future life. It has been juſtly remarked that no man ever denied the exiſtence of a God, but he, who has every thing to fear from his juſtice. This remark is applicable to a future life : that man muſt be flagitious in the extreme to whom annihilation is a deſirable object, and no other man ever denied or diſbelieved a future life : the Heathens believed it, the ſavage Indians believe it. The diſciples of Epicurus the moſt corrupt of all Heathens rather doubted

doubted than denied it. It is uſeleſs to cite authorities, the truth is indiſputable, there is nothing ſo deeply impreſſed on the mind of man as the belief of futurity. Our modern Philoſophers, though they pretend not to believe it, cannot ceaſe to fear it, For, if they have no certainty that there is an after life as they pretend, they muſt admit that they have no certainty that there is not. A ſtate of uncertainty is a ſtate of anguiſh and anxiety, and having nothing to hope, they muſt have every thing to fear. Nor can this fear be extinguiſhed but with reaſon.

Setting all authority apart, let us conſult reaſon on this ſubject, of all others the moſt important.

It has been already clearly ſhewn that the human ſoul has no principle of diſſolution in it, that it is independent on the body in its higheſt operations ; that it is immortal of its own nature, that the dictates of right reaſon are its immediate rule of action, and that every deviation from the dictates of right reaſon, is an offence puniſhable by the author of reaſon. For it is a general rule that, he who gives the law or rule of action, rewards the obſervance of the law, or puniſhes the tranſgreſſion. This obſervance of the law is not always rewarded in the preſent life, nor the moſt capital tranſgreſſions always puniſhed, they muſt therefore in the future ; if not, the ſanctity, juſtice and providence of God would be expoſed to cenſure, his ſanctity, in the encouragement which impunity gives to vice, and wickedneſs, his juſtice in not rewarding obedience to his law according to its merits, his providence in not taking the neceſſary meaſures, that all ſhould receive according to their deſerts. He does not deſerve the name of ruler, much leſs of ſovereign ruler, who does not. In vain the Deiſt pretends that God's juſtice, ſanctity and providence is not ſimilar to that of man. It is true, all the imperfections of human juſtice, ſanc-

tity

tity and providence are excluded, the ſanctity of God infinitely ſurpaſſes that of man in perfection, ſo does his juſtice and his providence? Does a man's ſanctity encreaſe by encouraging vice? Is his juſtice more perfect by diſcouraging virtue? Is he more provident in permitting the worſt of bad ſubjects, to obtain greater privileges than the beſt?

If juſtice requires that virtue ſhould be rewarded, it is yet more conſiſtent with juſtice, that vice ſhould be puniſhed according to its demerits. Why ſo? Becauſe virtue is according to nature and vice againſt it, the virtuous man therefore, follows the plan which the author of his Being has traced and anſwers the end of his creation; the vicious man does not. It is ſtrictly juſt that he ſhould ſuffer: and as it is a diſorder that he ſhould act according to his own will regardleſs of the will of his Creator. Order and juſtice require that he ſhould ſuffer according to the will of his Creator though againſt his own.

The fear of puniſhment in a future life, ſays the Deiſt, was introduced by politicians to reſtrain their ſubjects. It is therefore uſeful to mankind, if anarchy, the worſt of all evils, be prevented by it, or even inſurrection, which is in itſelf ſo great an evil, that oppreſſion cannot authoriſe it. It is an attempt to remove a head-ache by a doſe of arſenic.

But when did theſe politicians meet? Where? By what means have they duped not only the unthinking croud, but the Philoſopher, the man of ſenſe, the man of ſcience, the whole world for ages back, if you except a few two-legged hogs of Epicurus's herd and their worthy ſucceſſors the modern Philoſophers?

God, ſays the Deiſt, is immutable, man's actions therefore cannot offend him, True, man's actions cannot offend God ſo as to introduce any change in his diſpoſitions; but it is equally true, that man does

what

what he can to offend him, and thereby introduces a change in himself, instead of being a virtuous man according to rule and order, he becomes a vicious man contrary to rule and order, and is by that same rule brought to order. The immediate rule of man's action is the light of reason, which is an emanation of the divine reason, the universal rule, all actions inconsistent with this rule are disorderly.

Man has an innate desire of happiness, it is implanted in his nature, it is therefore from the author of nature, punishment hereafter is inconsistent with this desire, renders it ineffectual, which cannot be said of a desire implanted by God himself. Hence the Deist pretends to exclude all punishment from a future life. But this innate desire of happiness shews that future happiness is attainable by man, not that all men will attain it, as a horror of future punishment shews the possibility of avoiding it, not that all men will avoid it, God, the supreme ruler, directs all Beings according to their nature, inanimate Beings by fixed and invariable laws, but man possessed of reason is left to his own direction, within certain limits, it is true, that he may not derange the general plan; if then man conducts himself according to the plan traced out by his Creator, he will arrive at the end, if not, it is not surprising that he should be excluded; it would be surprising if he were not: because he would arrive at the term by forsaking the path.

In a word, God by every possible right is man's lawful superior; a lawful superior has a strict right to exact obedience to just and equitable laws, of which the inferior cannot be ignorant but through culpable neglect; the light of reason points out the great principles of the law; a law without proposing either rewards or punishments, without any inducement to observe it, is ridiculous, and argues ignorance and stupidity in the Legislator;

Legiſlator; hence it is manifeſt that obedience claims ſome reward and diſobedience calls aloud for puniſhment. In this life rewards are frequently obtained without merit, ſometimes by the moſt atrocious crimes, and puniſhments inflicted on innocence. This therefore is not the time of retribution. This doctrine juſtifies Providence in the diſtribution of theſe temporal advantages which are thought to conſtitute happineſs in the preſent life. For as man is compoſed of a mortal body and an immortal ſoul, is poſſeſſed of reaſon to direct the choice, and a power of ſelf-determination to make a proper choice, it is perfectly conſiſtent with our ideas of Providence that he ſhould be allowed a certain time of trial, during which, if he not only makes an improper choice, in making an immortal ſoul ſubſervient to a corruptible body contrary to the dictates of reaſon, but obſtinately perſeveres in it, abuſing both liberty and reaſon to the end of the time, that he ſhould receive puniſhment proportioned to the abuſe. Immediately to puniſh would exclude repentance on the part of man, and clemency on the part of his Judge. Never to puniſh would encourage iniquity and make a God of ſanctity, the accomplice of crimes. This reaſoning is applicable to virtue: it is tried in adverſity, and perſeverance ſhews it to be ſolid, its reward therefore muſt ſucceed the time of trial, and not immediately accompany it. Hence the belief of a future life juſtifies Providence in the very unequal diſtribution of proſperity, and adverſity, which to the Heathens was inconceivable, and, as their views were confined to the preſent life, induced many to doubt, and ſome to deny the interference of Providence in human affairs. There is nothing which ſo viſibly ſhews the little value, which God ſets on wealth and power, as the diſtribution he makes, and the ſort of characters to whom theſe gifts are granted. Heliogabalus and Sardanopholus

have

have been maſters of the world; quære were there two more contemptible wretches in it?

Having thus ſhewn, by a train of the moſt concluſive reaſoning, that an after life muſt be admitted, to juſtify the providence, the juſtice and ſanctity of God, it is not difficult to ſhew that the reſurrection of the body is perfectly conſiſtent with reaſon: man is a compoſed Being, the ſoul is not a man, much leſs the body, the ſoul and body united conſtitute the man. Though the ſoul makes uſe of the body as an inſtrument in many of its operations, more particularly in the practice of virtue or vice, yet the body cannot be conſidered ſimply as an inſtrument, but as a part, it is the man, not the ſoul, that relieves indigence or oppreſſes innocence, to the man therefore the reward of virtue or the puniſhment of vice is due, the body therefore muſt be re-united to the ſoul that, the whole man, and not a part of him may receive the reward of his virtues or the puniſhment due to his crimes.

It is in vain to pretend that by death the union is diſſolved, and the body reduced to aſhes, as if greater power were neceſſary to re-unite theſe parts, which though diſſolved, exiſt, than to create, and unite them originally. To deny the poſſibility of the reſurrection is to deny the omnipotence of the Divinity, and turn Atheiſt. The only reaſon offered againſt the reſurrection, which deſerves a reply, is, that, men are known to feed on human fleſh, that, of courſe, the ſame particles ſerve to conſtitute the bodies of different men. To obviate this, and all ſimilar difficulties, it muſt be conſidered that, though the ſame identical body muſt be united to the ſoul, elſe it would not be a reſurrection of the fallen body, but an aſſumption of another, it is not neceſſary that all the different particles of matter which have ſucceſſively ſerved to form the body ſhould be united in its reſurrection: of theſe the ſuperfluous muſt

muſt be rejected as uſeleſs, hence then if the particles of one body, which have ſerved to conſtitute another, be neceſſary to the former, they may be reſtored, and their place ſuppplied in the latter, by others, which would have been ſuperfluous. There is no Savage whoſe food is confined to human fleſh: he muſt conſume other things alſo, as water, fruits and vegetables, his body of courſe, cannot be entirely formed of the fleſh of his fellows. In the reſurrection all excreſcences will be retrenched, and defects ſupplied, by the power of God.

A queſtion of no ſmall importance preſents itſelf, that is, whether this future life, in which the juſt man obtains the reward of his virtues, and the impious man the puniſhment of his crimes, be eternal and immutable or terminable after a certain time.

If the reſurrection of the juſt be admitted and a ſtate of happineſs aſſigned, as the reward of their virtues, no poſſible reaſon can be aſſigned why they ſhould be deprived of it. The privation of ſovereign happineſs is a moſt ſevere puniſhment, puniſhment always ſuppoſes a crime, which in a ſtate of conſummate happineſs is impoſſible. Add to this, that a ſtate of conſummate happineſs excludes every evil, and every apprehenſion of evil. The loſs of ſovereign happineſs is the greateſt of all evils, and the certainty of loſing it, an object of the greateſt and moſt juſt apprehenſion.

Moreover man does not arrive at his ultimate end until all his natural deſires are ſatisfied, he not only deſires happineſs, but the continuation of happineſs, for ſince he deſires happineſs but for himſelf, he muſt deſire it to continue, as long as he himſelf continues to exiſt, and as he is himſelf immortal his happineſs muſt be ſo too.

Nothing ſhort of conſummate happineſs can ſatisfy the

the natural defires of man : whilſt happineſs is incomplete it is capable of ſome addition, and the mind of man, boundleſs in its deſires, muſt continue to deſire what is wanted, until its happineſs be conſummate. Hence it appears that no created object can make man happy, becauſe all created objects are limited ; limitation argues a want of ſome perfection, which is the object of deſire. Hence alſo it follows that conſummate happineſs cannot be obtained in this life: for this life is ſubject to many and unavoidable evils, ignorance, inordinate attachments, infirmities and death, no wealth, no power, can ward off theſe.

True and conſummate happineſs conſiſts in the contemplation of God, no limited object can make man truly happy. God alone is infinite, he is the ſource of true happineſs : in him the underſtanding ſees all truth, and in him the will finds all that is good, in him terminate all the purſuits of man, he is his laſt end as he is his firſt beginning. The will always tends to its object whilſt abſent, and reſts in the poſſeſſion of the object when preſent.

Though happineſs conſiſts in the contemplation of God, and is rather the operation of the underſtanding contemplating the object, and propoſing it to the will, than of the will, which is pleaſed in the poſſeſſion, yet true happineſs does not conſiſt in that confuſed knowledge, which all men have of the Divinity ; whether the idea of a God, be innate in man, that is, impreſſed on the ſoul at the inſtant of its creation, as ſome pretend, or ſo eaſily attained that the leaſt reflection ſuffices to form it, it is certain that this confuſed knowledge is ſubject to numberleſs errors : it is uſeleſs to ſpeak of the errors of the Heathens, they are known to every man, who knows any thing, error is an evil, which true happineſs excludes.

Nor does conſummate happineſs conſiſt in that know-

ledge of God, which is obtained by demonſtration ; the Philoſopher demonſtrates that the divine eſſence is one eternal, immutable, infinitely wiſe and powerful, unlimited in all perfection, but, as reaſon, nor even imagination cannot reach infinity, the mind is yet deſirous of having a more adequate idea of all theſe perfections, and of an infinite number of perfections, of which we have no idea at all.

Finally, conſummate happineſs does not conſiſt in the knowledge of God as obtained by faith : though many of God's perfections be known to us by faith, which human reaſon could not attain, and even theſe perfections, which reaſon may attain, are more clearly known by faith, as is manifeſt from this that many of the divine perfections clearly known to the Chriſtian Philoſopher, were but obſcurely known, if at all, to the Heathen : yet, as by faith, theſe perfections tranſcending reaſon, and founded on external evidence, are not clearly conceived, the mind is yet deſirous of a more conſummate knowledge. The light of faith does not make the object viſible to the underſtanding, but it makes it viſibly credible, what we ſee is the object of ſcience, not of faith ; hence it follows that conſummate happineſs conſiſts in ſeeing God as he is in himſelf : until this object is obtained the mind is in purſuit, conſequently never at reſt ; but this view of God as he is in himſelf terminates all purſuits : in him the underſtanding ſees all truth, it can deſire no more ; in him the will finds all that is good, it can ſeek no more. All the deſires of the ſoul may be reduced to four, that of knowledge, of excellence, of pleaſure, and a perpetual continuation of it. By a diſtinct view of all truth, the deſire of knowledge is perfectly ſatiated, no greater excellence can be ſought than a participation of the divine, which is attained by the adheſion and quieſcence of the underſtanding to truth in its ſource, and of the will to ſo-

vereign goodneſs; for when one Being is united to another both by diſtinct knowledge, and boundleſs love, no union can be more ſtrict, hence the Saints abſorbed in the excellence of God participate in it, and all deſires of greater excellence muſt ceaſe. Pleaſure reſults from the poſſeſſion of the object of deſire, and is proportioned to the object. The poſſeſſion of infinite goodneſs muſt produce unlimited pleaſure. Happineſs would not be conſummate if any apprehenſion of loſing it remain, but a clear and diſtinct view of God removes all apprehenſion, for in this view conſiſts eternal life.

This diſtinct view of the Divinity is not attainable by the ſoul of man from its natural powers. For that object which infinitely tranſcends the human underſtanding cannot be clearly conceived by it; no exertion of its natural powers can reach infinity. Hence an influx of the divine light is indiſpenſably neceſſary to enable any created underſtanding to ſee the Divinity: if an agent be rendered capable of an action, which ſurpaſſes its natural powers, it muſt be by extending the power, which it formerly poſſeſſed, or by the addition of ſome new power, which it did not poſſeſs; there is no extenſion of a finite power, which can raiſe it to an action infinitely tranſcending its nature, hence it is eſſentially neceſſary to add a power, which the underſtanding does not poſſeſs, to enable it clearly and diſtinctly to ſee the Divinity. This addition of intellectual power is called the illumination of the underſtanding.

Though the underſtanding of man cannot by its natural powers have a diſtinct view of the Divinity, yet it is his laſt end and the only object capable of fixing all his deſires: the laſt end of the principal agent is that of all ſubordinate agents; the underſtanding is in man the principal agent: it propoſes all objects to the will, the will directs the inferior appetites, and theſe ſet the body in motion,

motion. The laſt end of man is therefore that of the underſtanding. The object of the underſtanding is truth, and its ultimate end, primary truth in its ſource, that is, in the Divinity, thus every man ſeeing any effect is naturally deſirous of knowing the cauſe, and this deſire is never ſatisfied until the firſt great cauſe of all things is known. In this firſt cauſe all enquiries terminate; hence man's laſt end is to know his God, and in this diſtinct viſion of God he obtains poſſeſſion of eternal life. The act is ſpecified by its object, and partakes of the perfection of its object, the contemplation of eternal truth is not merely in time, the object is itſelf eternal, the light by which the underſtanding contemplates the object is alſo eternal, and the ſoul is immortal, hence poſſeſſion of eternal life is obtained by a diſtinct view of God. Nor can it be loſt. In it conſummate happineſs conſiſts, it muſt therefore exclude every apprehenſion, every poſſibility of its ceſſation. They who ſee God immediately cannot ceaſe to love him, for, as the immediate viſion of the Divinity conſtitutes perfect happineſs, it excludes every evil, the underſtanding is free from error, ſeeing truth in its very ſource, it therefore cannot propoſe a more lovely object to the will, and the will itſelf poſſeſſed of the ſource of all goodneſs can purſue no other object.

Nor will God withdraw that divine light, by which they ſee him, nor otherwiſe conceal himſelf from them: either the one or the other would be a ſevere puniſhment, muſt therefore ſuppoſe ſome crime, which in a ſtate of conſummate happineſs is impoſſible.

From all we have ſaid on this ſubject it appears perfectly conſiſtent with reaſon that the reward of the juſt ſhould be eternal. From the natural deſire of man and his capacity to attain happineſs, conſummate happineſs muſt be his laſt end. If this end were impoſſible, and

to

to be attained by no man, the desire impressed on the soul of man would be vain, and illusive; it would argue the malice of its author, not that sovereign goodness which is characteristic of the Divinity. If this end be attainable, it is but reasonable that these, in preference and exclusively, should attain it, whose actions have been in the course of life conformable to that rule of conduct, which they have received from their author, that is, the light of reason. To exclude these, and admit others, whose actions have been invariably influenced by passion, regardless of the dictates of reason, or even to admit both indiscriminately, is inconsistent with the justice, the sanctity, the wisdom and providence of God.

The next question which presents itself is of all others the most important and the most violently contested by all the partizans of pleasure, that is, the punishment of vice. Is it in a future life eternal?

It must be admitted that man by acting contrary to the dictates of reason, at least, withholds that obedience which he owes his maker; that he shews a contempt of the law, or rule of action impressed on his mind, and consequently of the Legislator; that though no action of his can at all affect his good, who from his nature is incapable of being effectively injured, the injury as far as in man's power is offered by a formal act of disobedience and contempt, add to this that an injury is effectively offered, and sustained, either by the person who commits the crime, or some other person who is under the direction of God's providence, and consequently under his protection. These truths are incontestible and from them it evidently follows that sin is offensive and displeasing to the Divinity.

The offence may be greater or less as it is more or less consistent with rule, thus, a small excess is not so inconsistent with the rule of temperance as absolute intoxication.

toxication. The ſtoic Philoſophers and ſome modern ſpeculatiſts think all ſins equal, as ſin is a privation of rectitude, and privations, ſay they, are neither increaſed, nor diminiſhed. This is one of the many paradoxes, which the ſpirit of innovation has introduced, which puts common ſenſe to the bluſh. What! a jocoſe lie to amuſe a company is as grievous an offence as the maſſacre of a city! No, there is a total and a partial privation. Death is a total privation of life, and diſeaſe but a partial privation, or if you will take diſeaſe for a privation of health, it moſt certainly can be increaſed or diminiſhed. The privation of rectitude in ſin is of this nature, it may increaſe or diminiſh, it may be more or leſs conſiſtent with rule, conſequently more or leſs grievous.

If there be a total deviation from the laſt end, that is, if a man formally prefers the purſuit, or poſſeſſion of any created object, to the purſuit or poſſeſſion of conſummate happineſs, in the contemplation of the Divinity, the ſin is called mortal becauſe it is a total privation of ſpiritual life. If the deviation be not abſolute, that is, if a formal preference be not given to ſome created object, but ſome act committed, which though defective, through inadvertence, or levity, is not formally and maliciouſly againſt rule, the offence is called venial, becauſe it does not deſtroy man's tendency to his laſt end, though it may retard and impede him. If the offence be mortal, it is in its own nature irreparable: as after death there remains no principle in the body, which can reſtore life, ſo after the perpetration of a mortal crime, there remains no principle in the ſoul, which can reinſtate it. If the offence be venial it may be effaced, as in the body, whilſt life remains, a diſeaſe may be removed, ſo whilſt the tendency to the laſt end continues in the ſoul, the impediments may be removed; but if by a total deviation that tendency

dency be loſt, the attainment of the end is impracticable. If the human body be put in contact with certain ſubſtances, it contracts a ſtain, and loſes its native beauty, ſo the ſoul from an inordinate attachment to forbidden objects, contracts the ſtain of ſin, and loſes its beauty. There is a two-fold beauty in the ſoul unſullied by ſin; the firſt reſulting from the light of reaſon, and the ſecond from the light of grace. This ſtain remains, though the act which produced it paſſes, as the ſtain contracted by the body, from being in contact with ſome foul ſubſtance, remains, though the ſubſtance be removed. As the ſtain of ſin is contracted by an attachment to ſome forbidden object which cauſes a deviation from the laſt end, it is neceſſary not only to renounce the attachment, but alſo to reſume a direction to the laſt end, as it is neceſſary not only to remove the foul ſubſtance which ſtains the body, but alſo to cleanſe the ſtain; hence the immutability of the will immediately on the termination of life. The laſt inſtant of life being the laſt of the time of trial, the ſoul has arrived at the end, which in life ſhe purſued: if her purſuits were directed to the proper end according to the dictates of reaſon, her reward is certain; if on the contrary abuſing reaſon, and liberty, her purſuits during the time of trial, were directed to ſome end, which reaſon condemns, her puniſhment is unavoidable. As mortal ſin extinguiſhes every principle of life in the ſoul, it has not power within itſelf to reſume its tendency to the laſt end. During the time of trial an aſſiſtance both natural, and ſupernatural, is offered to enable the ſoul to reſume the ſtrait path, if rejected in the time of trial, when that time ceaſes, ſuch aſſiſtance would be uſeleſs, and is offered no more; hence the will is immutably fixed on evil. Add to this that it is natural for every thing when it comes to its laſt term to reſt in it, if it be not ſet in motion and removed

moved from it by ſome more powerful agent. The man, who in the courſe of life has directed his purſuits to the attainment of ſome created object, or the gratification of ſome paſſion, regardleſs of the laſt end of his creation, is, at death, arrived at the term, the affection of his mind is therefore immutably fixed to the object of his purſuits, and cannot be changed but by ſome exertion of divine power. It is in vain to expect ſuch an exertion: it would extend the time of trial beyond its term, and confound it with the time of reward, and puniſhment; hence it is manifeſt that the puniſhment of ſin muſt be eternal: becauſe in the ſinful ſoul there is no power of deſtroying that affection to an improper object, which induces puniſhment, nor any diſpoſition to be diſengaged from it by the divine power.

Every tranſgreſſion of the law is inductive of puniſhment: it is the ſanction of the law, without which no law can exiſt; this puniſhment is from the nature of things two-fold, an excluſion from the poſſeſſion of the laſt end, and ſenſible pain. Juſtice proportions the puniſhment to the offence: there is no puniſhment better proportioned to a contempt of the laſt end, than an abſolute excluſion, but as the tranſgreſſion does not ſimply conſiſt in a contempt of the laſt end, but alſo in an adherence to ſome improper end, or ſenſible object, juſtice adds a ſenſible pain, correſpondent to this inordinate attachment. If no ſenſible pain were inflicted, the puniſhment would not be proportioned to the offence: it might be conſidered as null, in the idea of the criminal, however great in itſelf: an excluſion from that, which is not deſired, is not thought a puniſhment by any man: hence ſenſible pain, beſides an excluſion from the poſſeſſion of God, is eſſentially neceſſary to ſanction the law. Both the one and the other muſt be eternal: for ſince that diſpoſition of the ſoul, which

prefers

prefers ſome ſenſible object to the poſſeſſion of conſummate happineſs in the contemplation of God, is inductive of puniſhment as an abuſe of reaſon, whilſt that diſpoſition continues the puniſhment correſpondent to it muſt continue, death the laſt term immutably fixes this criminal diſpoſition, makes it eternal, and conſequently the puniſhment due to it. It is true the ſoul has, from its nature, a capacity of receiving grace in this life, and glory in the next. It has no natural power of acquiring either the one or the other becauſe they tranſcend the order of nature and hence are called ſupernatural; but there is this eſſential difference that, in the courſe of life, the will is not immutably fixed, hence though the ſoul has no power of reſuming that life of grace, which ſin has extinguiſhed, it has yet the capacity of receiving this life from the divine power, but in death the will is immutably fixed, and the capacity of receiving either grace, or glory, may in ſome ſenſe be ſaid to remain, there is an inſuperable bar, that is, the immutability of the will in its affection to ſome forbidden object.

A thouſand difficulties have been ſtarted againſt this doctrine, which however ſimple and founded on the moſt ſolid principles of reaſon it may appear, is yet in itſelf ſo terrible, that the mind of man, as by inſtinct, endeavors to invalidate or avoid it. And all theſe men, whoſe purſuits are confined to pleaſure, unanimouſly reject it.

Some pretend that to inflict an endleſs puniſhment for an inſtantaneous tranſgreſſion, is inconſiſtent with juſtice, with goodneſs, with mercy or even with power. Theſe men ſeem to imagine that the puniſhment of a crime ſhould be of the ſame duration with the tranſgreſſion, a rule obſerved in no Court of Equity: the puniſhment is proportioned to the malice of the crime, not to its duration, and the malice of an offence is pro-

portioned to the dignity of the perſon offended, an offence of the Divinity is of unbounded malice, and deſerves endleſs puniſhment, it is therefore perfectly conſiſtent with juſtice. In all countries, for any enormous crime againſt ſociety a man is for ever retrenched from that ſociety whether by death or perpetual baniſhment; an offence againſt charity, the bond of union amongſt the bleſſed, is a capital offence againſt that ſociety, and of courſe deſerves a perpetual excluſion.

Add to this that not only the act but the deſire, and the attachment to any forbidden object, is criminal, and conſequently deſerving of puniſhment. The man who perſeveres until death in purſuit of any created object, however flattering to his vanity, his ambition or his ſenſuality, has made his election: he has not only preferred that object to the poſſeſſion of conſummate happineſs in the contemplation of his God, in oppoſition to the dictates of reaſon, but obſtinately perſevered in that diſpoſition to the end, and ſince death immutably fixes his affection, it muſt be perpetual, and the correſpondent puniſhment of equal duration. Hence to inflict endleſs puniſhment is a neceſſary effect of juſtice. It is alſo perfectly conſiſtent with ſovereign goodneſs: to countenance or encourage evil, is not an effect of goodneſs, it would rather argue a defect; infinite goodneſs is infinitely oppoſite to evil, infinitely remote from evil, and of courſe infinitely inimical to evil. Whilſt this oppoſition continues, ſovereign goodneſs will exclude and diſcountenance evil; and ſince by death the ſinner's will is immutably fixed on evil, this oppoſition muſt be perpetual.

An act of mercy always proceeds from love, and, as God is ſovereignly good, and therefore infinitely inimical to evil, neither does nor can love that ſoul, which is immutably fixed on evil, he can extend no act of mercy

to

to her, perpetual puniſhment is therefore conſiſtent with mercy. This reaſoning is applicable to clemency.

All compariſons between God and ſovereign Princes, or parents, are defective: a compariſon might as well be inſtituted between *time* and *ſpace*. Princes and parents are men, are bound by certain laws to their ſubjects and children, ſtrictly obliged to attend to their welfare, an offence againſt them conſidered as ſuch is limited as they are themſelves. An offence againſt the Almighty is of courſe illimited in its malice, as he is infinite in goodneſs, if therefore an offence againſt an indulgent parent, or beneficent Prince argues a certain malice in the offender, which deſerves a temporal puniſhment proportioned to the offence, an offence againſt the Almighty, the univerſal Sovereign, Parent and Benefactor, from whom the offender holds life and all that contributes to ſuport life, to whom on the title of creation, of conſervation, of ſubjection, of gratitude, of love and dependence, he owes himſelf, and to whoſe glory he is obliged to contribute, ſuch an offence, and obſtinate perſeverance in it to the end, deſerves unqueſtionably a puniſhment endleſs as is the offence.

A temporal Prince in inflicting puniſhment may be guilty of cruelty, though the puniſhment does not ſurpaſs the enormity of the offence, becauſe he may intend the ſufferings of the criminal, not the ſatisfaction due to juſtice. This is inconſiſtent with divine goodneſs. It is the ſatisfaction due to juſtice, which is intended, and in it there is no cruelty.

In a word, if the man, who perſeveres in ſin to the end, ceaſes to ſin, it is becauſe he ceaſes to live. His deſire of ſin is perpetual and the puniſhment alſo.

Hitherto we have reaſoned on the attributes of the Deity as known to us by the light of reaſon unaſſiſted by any ſuperior light, and ſhewn that God is the firſt principle, and the laſt end of all his creatures; that all the

the Beings which compoſe the univerſe, hold from him their exiſtence, and the continuation of their exiſtence; that his providence ſuperintends and directs all creatures, the inanimate by fixed and determined laws; the irrrational by unerring inſtinct, preſenting rules for the rational part of his creatures to direct themſelves, never allowing them to diſturb the general plan, which in his wiſdom he has formed for the manifeſtation of his glory; we have alſo ſhewn that reaſon and free agency are excellent gifts worthy of their Author, of theſe the proper uſe and not the abuſe was intended, from the abuſe reſults moral evil, the exiſtence of which argues the malice of the evil doer, but does not affect the ſovereign goodneſs of God, who though he can neither encourage nor countenance evil, is not obliged to prevent it.

We have alſo ſhewn that a ſtate of trial, in which, if man acted conſiſtently with the dictates of reaſon, he ſhould obtain a reward, or, if he abuſed and perverted reaſon, he ſhould be expoſed to puniſhment, was reconcileable with the idea of Providence, and then proceeded to ſhew that the reward obtained by virtue or the puniſhment inflicted on vice muſt be without end.

In the courſe of the work we have remarked that man's innate deſire of happineſs, which he invariably purſues, however miſtaken in the object, and the boundleſs capacity of his mind, ſhew that he was intended for conſummate happineſs, which is to be attained but in the contemplation of the Divinity, in which truth ſeen immediately ſatisfies the underſtanding, and goodneſs in its ſource ſatiates all the deſires of the will. We have alſo clearly ſhewn that, there is no natural power in man equal to the attainment of this object, that no extenſion of his natural powers can arrive at it, that, what is called the light of glory, is indiſpenſably neceſſary. An example of this we have

in

in the natural order. The eye, however well conſtituted, or however its viſual powers may be increaſed or extended, cannot ſee an object even the moſt viſible, if totally deſtitute of light. How this light of glory is to be obtained is not immediately known to man from the light of reaſon, hence the abſolute neceſſity of revelation to enable man to attain the end, for which he was originally intended, as that capacity of arriving at the end with proper aſſiſtance manifeſtly ſhews.

The Heathen Philoſophers, whoſe powers of reaſoning were certainly great, and whoſe ſtudies were intenſe, were notwithſtanding ſubject to the moſt groſs and ridiculous errors. The unity of the Divine Being they knew, yet dared not avow it; of his providence they ſpoke in ambiguous terms; their frequent conſultation of oracles ſhew their belief of his preſcience, but this they thought dependent on the decrees of fate, by which all their pretended Gods were ſhackled. Their modes of worſhip were indecent and the whole plan of religion, which they had formed, compoſed of ſenſeleſs errors and ridiculous practices, to ſay no more.

Flattery firſt introduced a multiplicity of Deities, as theſe were faſhioned by the makers according to their own fancies they were made ſubject to all the vices, to which the Heathens themſelves were addicted, hence there is no paſſion, however extravagant, which had not its patron or patroneſs amongſt the Heathen Deities; this abuſe was ſo univerſal that one of their moſt ſevere moraliſts thought intoxication laudable in honor of Bacchus, and public proſtitution commendable in honor of Venus. Our modern Philoſophers, men abſorbed in ſenſuality, muſt regret theſe happy times, when they could with impunity and honor give a looſe to the moſt blind and ſenſeleſs deſires. Hence they unanimouſly reject a revealed religion, well know-

ing

ing that reaſon, unaſſiſted by a ſuperior light, is not more ſtrong now than in the days of Heathen ſuperſtition, conſequently incapable of reſtraining the violence of paſſion, and frequently acting in concert with it. A revealed religion with its promiſes of rewards, and puniſhments, is a moſt powerful reſtraint for theſe men, it has no attractive: it holds out nothing to them but confuſion here and torments hereafter. Theſe thoughts produce a certain anxiety, which diſturbs them in the enjoyment of their pleaſures, to quell this anxiety they exhauſt their imagination in purſuit of ſome plauſible reaſon to think this revealed religion with all its terrors a mere bug-bear. They have recourſe to what remains of the writings of the Heathens and glean all they have ſaid againſt revealed religion. This they obtrude on the ignorant, who form a vaſt majority in all ſocieties, as the productions of their own brains, gratifying at the ſame time both their malice and their vanity. It is in vain to claſs them as ſome writers do. They are all engaged in the ſame purſuit, that is, Epicurean pleaſure, all equally adverſe to that revealed religion, which condemns, and terrifies them, all declared enemies to ſubordination and order, and as ſuch enemies both to God and man. Theſe unfortunate men endeavor to perſuade themſelves, and others, that revelation is impoſſible, that it is uſeleſs, that it is totally unneceſſary, that it is not credible. Reaſon in their opinion is more than ſufficient to direct man to attain the end of his creation, and to pay the Supreme Being the homage which he exacts.

By revelation is underſtood a certain knowledge, which God communicates of the divine nature, or the divine will, hence many things are known from revelation, which reaſon cannot attain.

To reaſon againſt the poſſibility of revelation, argues the moſt ſtupid ignorance, as if God, whoſe underſtanding

ing is infinite and poſſeſſed of an infinity of truths, to which man's reaſon cannot reach, were incapable of making any of theſe truths known to him ; one man communicates his ideas to another by the intervention of ſounds, or letters, which are material, though ideas are ſpiritual ; and omnipotence, which has formed the tongue, the eye and the ear, the air which conveys ſound, and the light which impreſſes the image of the object on the optic nerve, will be deprived of this faculty !

But theſe truths tranſcend the knowledge of man. Yes, if unaſſiſted by a ſuperior light, as the ſatellites of Jupiter eſcape the naked eye, but are clearly ſeen by the aſſiſtance of the teleſcope.

We every day ſee men learn from other men truths, of which they had no previous idea, which ſeem to contradict their ideas, though theſe men, from whom they learn, have no power of infuſing light in their minds. What abſurdity then to pretend that from almighty power, and infinite wiſdom, they may not learn truths, of which they neither had nor would have any previous knowledge ?

Theſe truths, it is true, are not in the natural order or the common courſe of things, but they are perfectly conſiſtent with it, for there is nothing more natural than for an artiſt to make any change, which he thinks proper, in a piece of mechaniſm, and with reſpect to God the whole univerſe is ſuch. This alſo ſhews that the preſent order of things was an effect of choice, not of any natural determination. By the interference of ſecondary cauſes we every day ſee deviations from the eſtabliſhed order of things, or, if you will, from that order which frequently happens, to that which rarely happens, without prejudice of Divine Providence. Is the power and efficacy of the primary cauſe all-wiſe and omnipotent, more confined than that of a ſecondary cauſe ? The idea is ridiculous in the extreme

extreme. But continues the Deiſt we have no certainty of any revelation made to man, theſe, who pretend to have heard truths revealed might have been dupes or impoſtors: it cannot be proved that they did not intend to deceive us; nor can it be proved that they themſelves were not deceived. To this the writer replies that there are proofs the moſt ſatisfactory, that the men, who tranſmitted revealed truths of religion to us, were neither deceived nor deceivers; that they did not intend to deceive, and if they did, that they could not. Theſe proofs are taken from the nature of theſe truths themſelves, which breathe nothing contrary to reaſon, nothing, which does not give man elevated ideas of his Creator, nothing, which does not inſpire ſanctity and virtue, nothing, which does not tend to man's perfection here, and happineſs hereafter, in a word nothing, which does not ſhew the divinity of the Author: theſe may be conſidered as the internal evidence of revealed truths, and the external proofs are taken from the character of the writers, and the impoſſibility of their impoſing on the world; they were men under the influence of no temporal intereſt, had no ſiniſter views; ſimply and unequivocally they atteſted the truth, knowing it muſt be at the expenſe of their lives. They foretold what it was not poſſible for man to foreſee, and in confirmation of the truths, which they announced, the laws of motion, at other times invariable, were frequently ſuſpended. That there have been miracles ſuppoſed, and revelations feigned intentionally to deceive, is true, but that indiſcriminately all have been dupes and impoſtors; that of the many thouſands who atteſt, of the many men of the moſt profound erudition, and great penetration who aſſert that they themſelves were witneſſes, there has not been one honeſt man, is a moſt impudent and ſhameleſs aſſertion, an aſſertion which a man who has any remains of modeſty would

not

not dare to make: he might as well pretend that becauſe ſome men tell lies, no man tells truth, or becauſe there are ſome bank notes forged there are none of any value, or, if you will, becauſe there are ſome men blind, there are none who can ſee; but he is told that there are certain rules for detecting falſhood, that theſe muſt be applied, and the deceit, if any there be, muſt appear. Theſe ſuppoſed miracles and feigned revelations ſo far from ſhewing that all are ſo, evidently argue the contrary: for falſhood is the fiction of truth, and copies, however faithleſs and faulty, ſhew the original true, hence if there were no true miracles, there never would have been a falſe one, nor would there be a fictitious revelation, if there had not been a real one previous, which the fiction counterfeits.

The revelation of myſteries, that is, of truths to reaſon inconceivable, is, if we believe the Deiſt, totally impoſſible. Yet we know, and the Deiſt muſt know, if he knows any thing, that many truths even in the natural order, and within the limited ſphere of human reaſon, are evident to men of ſcience, which to the illiterate Mechanic, are as myſterious as any revealed truth whatſoever. Will not the unlearned Mechanic believe the Aſtronomer that the Earth performs its revolution round the Sun, though his ſenſes tell him, and ſeem to aſſure the contrary. The aſſertion he muſt believe ſimply on the credit of the Aſtronomer, becauſe he has not the moſt diſtant idea of the principles on which it is founded, the Deiſt ſurely will admit that the divine underſtanding as far ſurpaſſes the human, as that of the moſt learned man, does the reaſoning faculty of the artiſan; if then the credit of the Aſtronomer be ſufficient to eſtabliſh a truth, which contradicts ſenſe, why may not the infallibility of the divine word eſtabliſh a truth which tranſcends reaſon?

Myſterious truths are not evident in themſelves, that is, they do not appear immediately to us, but they are evidently certain, becauſe they are founded on the divine word, which excludes falſhood. The object of reaſon is to determine whether the truth propoſed be revealed or not; and, as that is matter of fact, it is determined as all other facts are by concurring teſtimonies: if the motives of credibility be ſufficiently ſtrong to induce a well-founded belief, that the truth propoſed has been revealed, the enquiries of human reaſon ceaſe: why ſo? Becauſe there is nothing more reaſonable than to believe infallible authority, however myſterious the truth may appear.

Theſe miracles by which revealed truths were firſt eſtabliſhed, are yet continued, not in themſelves, but in their effect, the converſion of the world, which is of all others the greateſt, a viſible miracle which flaſhes conviction on the underſtanding: that the learned and the ignorant, the Prince and the peaſant, men of all nations, and times, whoſe names and cuſtoms are as different as their faces, ſhould unanimouſly admit truths inconceivable, inductive of the moſt ſevere and mortifying reſtraints, contradicting the moſt violent inclinations of corrupt nature, is a miraculous effect of almighty power, and if this converſion of the world be effected without a miracle, it is itſelf greater than any poſſible miracle. Add to this, that the revelation of truths tranſcending reaſon is indiſpenſably neceſſary to direct man to a ſupernatural end, for which we have already ſhewn him to be originally intended. As man can never deſire that, of which he has no idea, nor can he have recourſe to means, which are to him not known, it is therefore neceſſary, that this ſupernatural end ſhould be revealed to him, and the means by which it may be attained, and ſince the means are always proportioned to the end, the end being ſupernatural, that

that is, tranſcending the natural powers of man, the means muſt be ſo too.

It is true myſterious objects are not viſible to the eye, but we believe many things, which we do not ſee, nor cannot ſee, our thoughts are not viſible to the eye, nor are the thoughts or ſecret diſpoſitions of others viſible even to our minds, yet we believe that other men think, of this we have indications ſufficiently ſtrong to remove all doubts. It is from ſuch indications that we believe myſterious truths revealed, which are viſible neither to our eyes nor to our minds, truths of courſe, which give us a more ſublime idea of our God, and a more diſtinct knowledge of the divine nature. The moſt diſtinct knowledge that we can have of the divine nature, is, that it infinitely ſurpaſſes the utmoſt ſtretch of any limited imagination, ſuch is the idea, which certain revealed myſteries convey.

If, ſays the Deiſt, a revealed religion be ſubſtituted to the natural religion common to all, and at all times, it argues a change incompatible with the immutability of God. To this it may be replied that God's decrees are eternal, but the execution of theſe decrees is ſucceſſive, according to the order which he himſelf has determined.

It is not more ſtrange than true that men are found ſo blinded by prejudice as to aſſert that revelation is not uſeful to man, as if it were uſeleſs to man to learn, by a ſimple, conciſe and unerring method, all that in this life he can know of the divine nature, of the worſhip which the Deity expects, and exacts, and all his relative duties as a man, and a member of ſociety. If inconveniences have happened, and different ſects have been formed, diſagreeing in opinions, this is not imputable to revelation, but to the depravity of man, who endeavors to warp revelation from its true and natural ſignification, and make it ſubſervient to his private views :

revelation

revelation is not more abuſed than reaſon. Will any man be ſo perverſe as to pretend that reaſon is uſeleſs becauſe it is ſo often abuſed, and ſometimes to the worſt of purpoſes?

The advantages which reſult from revelation are innumerable and invaluable: without it a great majority of the human ſpecies could never attain a competent knowledge of the Divinity, or of their own relative duties, ſome through a natural indiſpoſition are incapable of acquiring this knowledge, others, whoſe whole time is abſorbed in purſuit of the firſt neceſſaries of life, food and raiment, many whoſe time is devoted to pleaſure, youth in general is incapable of the intenſe ſtudy and the abſtruſe and metaphyſical diſquiſitions neceſſary. To obtain by dint of reaſoning, even a ſlender knowledge of the divine attributes, to paſs in ſilence the mutability of the human mind, continually changing its opinions if it be not fixed by infallible authority. There are in revelation many obſcure paſſages, ſome from the nature of the truths which they diſcloſe, ſome, which at the time, and in the places, where they were firſt diſcloſed, were perfectly intelligible, at this diſtance from both, appear to us obſcure, and ſome obſcurities intended by the writers themſelves to exerciſe the mind of the reader, and ſuppreſs his pride, but the attributes of the Divinity are clearly and diſtinctly revealed; the end of man's creation; the great principles of morality; the means, by which, this end is to be obtained, and many other things, which human reaſon could not diſcover, are announced without any ambiguity. If theſe principles of morality are by ſome neglected, it only proves that paſſion in ſome men overpowers all reſtraints, not that the reſtraint impoſed by revealed religion is weak or uſeleſs.

From what we have ſaid appears not only the utility but

but the neceſſity of revelation. The inſufficiency of reaſon to direct man in the purſuit of true happineſs is known from the experience of all ages: not one of the Heathen Philoſophers, after all their reſearches, diſcovered that, which conſtitutes it; not one who did not, both by precept and example, authoriſe intolerable errors in morality. The idolatrous ſuperſtitions of all the different nations whom revelation did not enlighten atteſt this truth; that there is but God himſelf, who can teach his creatures to honor and adore him in ſpirit and truth; the moſt ſenſible and convincing proof may be taken from the men who oppoſe this truth. Whilſt they boaſt the ſufficiency of human reaſon, they confound vice with virtue, they authoriſe licentiouſneſs, applaud ſuicide, encourage rebellion, remove all reſtraints, break down all the barriers. The principles taught in this new ſchool are not ſimply ſubverſive of ſocial happineſs but abſolutely deſtructive of the human ſpecies. There is between our modern Philoſophers and their predeceſſors the Heathens, this remarkable difference, that in the Heathen ſchools truth was ſought but through the inability of reaſon not aſſiſted by revelation not to be found, in our modern ſchools truth preſents itſelf and is expelled whilſt the moſt abſurd falſhoods ſupply its place.

The revelation of ſome ſupernatural truths was indiſpenſably neceſſary at all times, and muſt have been co-eval with the creation. For ſince man was intended for a ſupernatural end, and could neither by his natural powers know the end, nor the means, to attain the end, he muſt have known them from revelation, elſe that innate deſire of conſummate happineſs implanted in his nature, and that capacity of enjoying it, would have been illuſive, which is blaſphemy to aſſert; the end therefore of his creation, and the means to obtain the end, muſt have been revealed to our firſt Parent,

who,

who, being the immediate principle of the human ſpecies, muſt have been perfect both in body and mind, in body, to pro-create, and in mind, to inſtruct, and from him this primitive revelation muſt have been tranſmitted to his poſterity, whether by oral tradition, as ſeems probable, or by written documents, which ſeems more probable. To convey our thoughts to the eye by ſigns, as to the ear by ſounds, being equally a gift of the Creator, in the opinion of the moſt intelligent men.

Add to this, that a certainty of pardon for ſins committed on certain conditions is a ſtrong incentive to virtue; this certainty cannot be obtained but from revelation: by the light of reaſon we know that God is infinitely merciful, but we know alſo that he is infinitely juſt, it is impoſſible to know from reaſon on what conditions his juſtice may be ſatisfied, ſo as to extend his mercy to the man, who has been guilty of a capital offence, hence deſpair would be a neceſſary conſequence, and deſpair removes all reſtraints, this we know from experience; and the conduct of our modern Philoſophers evinces the truth: in deſpair theſe unfortunate men give themſelves up to all ſorts of uncleanneſs.

That God is infinitely good we know, and conſequently that he can forgive offences, but we know alſo that it is not conſiſtent with goodneſs to encourage evil by impunity; we know that the divine goodneſs does not exclude the divine juſtice: that juſtice muſt be ſatisfied, and what are the conditions we cannot know but from revelation. The conditions, on which a capital offence is forgiven, muſt be known but from the injured party, not preſumed by the offender.

If it be aſked why a more explicit revelation was made at the time of Moſes? A reaſon may be aſſigned; it was then more neceſſary to check the progreſs of idolatry,

idolatry, which the pride and licentiouſneſs of man had authoriſed to an intolerable exceſs, and though this revelation, or rather the ceremonial law inſtituted by it, was confined to the deſcendants of Jacob, the prodigies attending this revelation were known to all ſurrounding nations, and ſufficient to ſhew the weakneſs and vanity of the Heathen idols, and the ſhameleſs blindneſs of theſe, who ſacrifice to, or confide in them.

To enquire why this revelation was made to the deſcendants of Jacob, and not to other nations, is uſeleſs: ſuch a preference depends on the abſolute will of God, whoſe diſtribution of gratuitous favors to ſome is an effect of goodneſs not injurious to others, who have no title or claim on him. Where there are no claims there is no acceptation of perſons. An enquiry might be inſtituted with equal propriety why he created the angel ſuperior to man, or man to the mouſe.

The law eſtabliſhed by the miniſtry of Moſes was an extraordinary favor to the Jews, becauſe it explicitly pointed out all the great principles of the natural law, it was therefore a ſimple and infallible rule of action, though theſe principles might have been known to the Heathens, they were not: prejudice, paſſion, example, intereſt and other reaſons had effaced them from their minds in a great meaſure, few, if any obſerved them; theſe amongſt the Heathen nations, who obſerved the precepts of the natural law, were not obliged to obſerve the ceremonial precepts of the Jewiſh law: theſe precepts obliged but the Jews themſelves and proſelytes to their religion.

To this may be added, that as God always grants to every one of his creatures all that is neceſſary to the attainment of its end, if there be no impediment given, if any man remote from times or places, in which the revelation of ſupernatural truths is manifeſt, ſtrictly obſerves

the

the dictates of unprejudiced reaſon, and all the precepts of the natural law, God will either enlighten his underſtanding immediately, or ſend ſome other agent to inſtruct him, as Peter was ſent to inſtruct Cornelius.

The experience of ages ſhews that even men of extraordinary abilities, and intenſe ſtudy, though knowing the moſt common principles of the natural law, have been ſubject to the moſt groſs errors in remote conſequences, and in the application of firſt principles, if then, reaſon be inſufficient to direct the learned few, a ſupplement is indiſpenſably neceſſary for the bulk of mankind, this ſupplement, which perfects reaſon, is the infallible authority of revelation.

That a law founded on revelation has been announced, is a fact, which is not ſubject either to mathematical, or metaphyſical demonſtration, nor is it an intuitive truth, which is evident on the expoſition, it is known, as all other facts are known, by moral evidence, that is, by the teſtimony of unexceptionable witneſſes corroborated by circumſtances. Whether a truth founded on moral evidence be more certain than that which is founded on metaphyſical reaſoning is left to Logicians to decide; but it muſt be admitted that to deny the one is more dangerous and detrimental to ſociety than the other: thus for inſtance, in England a man may, with impunity, deny the ſpirituality of the ſoul, but if he were to deny that George the Third is King, it might procure him a halter. The former is a truth founded on metaphyſical reaſoning, the latter on mere moral evidence, the internal evidence of revelation as it is called by ſome, or perhaps more properly by others, corroborating evidence, is taken from the nature of the doctrine conſidered in itſelf; in it are truths, which man's imagination could not diſcover, truths which mortify his pride, contradict his moſt violent inclinations, teach him to ſubdue his paſſions, to eradi-

cate

cate the ſpirit of ſelf-love and private intereſt, inculcate the indiſpenſable neceſſity of univerſal benevolence without diſtinction of friends or enemies. In a word, truths which condemn every poſſible vice, even in thought, and enforce every virtue; ſuch doctrine and the plan of religion formed on it, atteſts the divinity of its author.

The external evidence of revelation is taken from theſe ſtupendous effects of divine power, called miracles, and of the divine preſcience called prophecies. By a miracle is underſtood an effect of omnipotence, to which no inferior power is competent; a work tranſcending the eſtabliſhed order of nature, which no ſecondary cauſe can produce, but as an inſtrument. Effects ſurpaſſing the power of man, but not that of angels, whether good, or bad, are ſaid to be admirable but not miraculous. By the ſuperior intelligence and activity of the agent, effects are produced, which excite admiration, though they do not tranſcend the eſtabliſhed laws, theſe may be conſidered as the productions of art.

An effect may ſurpaſs the mechanical powers, or the known eſtabliſhed laws of nature, either conſidered in itſelf, as if two bodies were to occupy the ſame place, the Sun to retrogade, or in the ſubject, in which the effect is produced, as the reſurrection of the dead, or the illumination of the blind, or in the manner of production, as if a fever be inſtantaneouſly removed, which by the powers of nature might be removed in the courſe of time.

That God may produce miraculous effects is inconteſtibly true: for ſince all the ſeveral Beings, which compoſe the univerſe, have been created by him, the nature of each different ſpecies is eſtabliſhed by his will, its powers of producing effects confined within certain limits, may be extended by that omnipotent

will which grants them, or reſtrained without being deſtroyed. By ſuch an extenſion of power or reſtraint an effect tranſcending the order of the particular nature of that cauſe may be produced, as when Sampſon pulled down the temple of Dagon, or the fire did not affect Sidrach, Miſach and Abednego in the furnace. Theſe effects, inconſiſtent with the nature of theſe particular cauſes as known to us, are perfectly conſiſtent with univerſal nature, for there is nothing more natural than for an artiſt at times to make uſe of an inſtrument according to his will, and for an omnipotent artiſt to produce any effect by any inſtrument, or to produce the effect immediately without any inſtrument at all.

We have already ſhewn that the creation of this world was an effect of choice ; that God was under no neceſſity either externally or internally to create, that he might have created this or any other, or no world at all ; the world depends on him, not he on the world, hence the order of all cauſes and effects depends on his abſolute will. To pretend that God may not produce an effect without the interference of any ſecondary cauſe, or that he cannot increaſe, or diminiſh the powers of ſecondary cauſes, is to make God dependent on his creatures not them on him, which would be an inverſion of all order. Hence it follows that no created agent, however great its power, can produce a miraculous effect : the agent cannot exceed the limits of its power ; all effects therefore, which it produces, muſt be according to the order of its nature. The powers of the angelical nature are ſuperior to the powers of human nature : powers of agency are correſpondent to the nature of the agent, the angelical nature is ſuperior to human nature, in which the ſoul is embarraſſed in its operations by a dependance on the body, hence an Angel, either of light, or darkneſs, from its ſuperior intelligence,

intelligence, and the rapidity of its motion, in the application of active to paſſive principles, may produce an effect which excites admiration, becauſe it is unuſual, but ſuch an effect muſt be produced according to theſe mechanical laws, by which the material world is governed. Thus, according to the law of gravitation a ſtone deſcends, a man, from his locomotive powers, will cauſe it to aſcend; but as his powers are confined within certain limits his action is confined to ſtones of a certain magnitude, and the aſcent to a certain height; an inviſible agent of greater powers will cauſe a ſtone of greater magnitude to aſcend to a greater height, or keep it ſuſpended in the air; ſuch an effect muſt excite admiration, yet in this there is nothing miraculous becauſe the effect is correſpondent to the power of the agent, according to the eſtabliſhed laws, but no extenſion of man's power, or of any created agent, can animate a dead body, becauſe this tranſcends the eſtabliſhed order of things. The reſurrection of a dead body is manifeſtly miraculous.

A miraculous deviation from the eſtabliſhed order of nature in particular cauſes, argues no change in God's decrees, becauſe all theſe deviations have been foreſeen, and pre-ordered, in the general plan of Providence; there is nothing more common, than deviations cauſed by the interference of ſecondary cauſes, yet all theſe are under the direction of that Providence, which ſuperintends the whole.

In vain does the Deiſt pretend that we do not know all the powers of mechanical cauſes; that we cannot diſtinguiſh a miraculous effect from that, which is produced by ſome mechanical cauſe; we ſee wonderful effects produced by chemical operations, ſay they, it is true we do not know all the powers of mechanical cauſes, nor the effects, which one body produces on the other, in virtue of the laws of gravitation, of attraction,

traction, of election or repulſion, nor is it neceſſary that we ſhould, but we know that no mechanical law can produce life in a dead body, or enable a man to walk on the ſeas as on dry land, to command the winds, becauſe theſe effects are contrary to the mechanical laws, and powers, which are known, and theſe, which we do not know, are not contrary to theſe, which we do know. It is not therefore ſo difficult to diſtinguiſh a miraculous effect from a production of art.

At leaſt, ſay they, the power of ſpiritual agents eſcapes our knowledge, yes, but we know their powers are confined within certain limits, and in a certain order: for no agent can act on any ſubject, not ſubject to its action, nor ſuſpend the laws eſtabliſhed by a ſuperior power, hence no ſpiritual created agent can effect a miracle. The reaſon, why increated power effects miracles, is, becauſe all nature is ſubject to, and dependent on it, and that all particular cauſes are but its inſtruments; as to the miracles which were pretended to be wrought amongſt the Heathens it is ſufficient to ſay that, the authors, from whom we learn theſe pretended miracles, did not believe them; Livy relates ſome, but he ſays in the preface of his work, "that he was not diſpoſed either to affirm or refute, "what was ſaid to happen, either before, or at the "building of the city, and which was rather adorned "by poetical fables, than authentic monuments of fact." "It is pardonable," ſays he, "in antiquity, to admit "ſome things divine, thereby to render the foundation "of their cities more venerable, and no more pardonable "than in the Roman people." In the 24th B. and 12th C. he ſays, "many prodigies were publiſhed this "year and the more the ſimple and credulous peo-"ple believed them, the more they were increaſed." In the 24th C. he ſays, "that the Conſuls having raiſed

"two

" two city legions, and filled up the other legions, did " not move from the city until they had procured pro- " digies." Theſe pretended prodigies were therefore, in the opinion of the authors who relate them, intended to encourage the ſoldiers, or ſecure the approbation of an ignorant and ſuperſtitious populace.

Valerius Maximus, in his 1ſt. B. having related many pretended miracles, adds, that " as theſe were not late " tranſactions, but depending on hearſay tradition, let " the authors vouch for them." *Fidem auctoris vindicent.* Suetonius, in the life of Claudius, ſays of theſe miracles, " I have related them not that I believe them true, " or veriſimilar." And Pauſanius, in the 6th B. ſays, " I have related, what the Greeks have circulated, but " nothing obliges me to believe them."

It was currently reported that great cures were performed in the temple of Æſculapius, and inſcriptions expreſſive of theſe miraculous cures on brazen tablets were hung up to commemorate the events. The artifices of the officers of all the Heathen temples to impoſe on a ſuperſtitious people are well known, the officers attendant on the temple of Æſculapius were phyſicians, and performed cures, as our phyſicians do, but with greater ceremony and myſtery, the effects of their medicines aſcribed to the pretended God, and certain perſons hired to pretend indiſpoſitions, which were inſtantaneouſly cured, rendered the temple famous, and increaſed the concourſe of votaries and wealth of the miniſters.

Suetonius and Tacitus ſay that, Veſphaſian wrought miracles in Alexandria. A blind man directed by Serapis, and a lame man ſays Suetonius, if we believe Tacitus he was not lame but maimed of an arm, that is a trifling difference, were inſtantly healed by that Prince. In anſwer to this it muſt be remarked that the Egyptians were extremely ſuperſtitious and conſidered Serapis as their great divinity, the crafty Prince could

could not endear himself more to them than by pretending to be a favorite of their beloved Serapis, and there was nothing more simple than to engage the ministers of Serapis, or his own ministers, to procure a counterfeit blind man to play a role, his unwillingness to undertake it was a mere artifice. The very relation of Tacitus shews it. He thought it would not succeed. Why then attempt it in public? He was told by the attendants that he was a favorite of the Gods. He knew it would succeed or he would not, and he must have known it from the actors, who knew his interest, and their own, was strengthened by the success, of which they could not doubt. Tacitus and Suetonius both agree that, these pretended miracles were intended to confirm the authority of that Prince, after his election, and that he was told by flattering courtiers that his election was pleasing to their Gods. It is true, Suetonius adds that some who were present attested the fact without hopes of reward. Undoubtedly a great majority of the people were duped as was intended by the actors. The same thing may be said of the pretended miracles of Hadrianus. Spartianus says that he cured a blind man, and woman, who were sent by the Gods to prevent him from putting himself to death. The motive shews the fraud, and Marius Maximus, as Spartianus himself says, relates it as a fiction. Marius's works are lost. To this may be added that, many things have happened amongst the Heathens, which surpass the power of man, but nothing surpassing the locomotive powers of the demons.

As to the miracles of Apollonius related by Philostratus. The whole of his composition is a tissue of absurdities, resembling our Arabian Nights' Entertainments, and deserves the same credit: he makes Apollonius understand the voice of birds and beasts, and says, that he learned that science from the Arabs, and adds other

tales

tales equally ridiculous. If any man wiſhes to know the Heathen tales and miracles let him read Ovid's Metamorphoſes which becauſe they could not happen did not happen.

Moſes ſays in the book of Exodus, that the Magicians in Egypt caſt their rods in preſence of Pharoah as Aaron did, and that there were ſerpents. The immediate diſappearance of the rods, and the ſubſtitution of ſerpents, which were numerous in Egypt, does not ſurpaſs the powers of an angel either of light or darkneſs. The converſion of a rod into a real ſerpent does. The very matter, of which the rods was compoſed, might be inſtantaneouſly ſo diſpoſed as to exhibit the appearance of a real ſerpent, and though not living it might appear in motion as an automaton, this ſeems more conſonant to Moſes's relation, becauſe he ſays that Aaron's rod devoured the rods of the Egyptians, which ſeems to indicate that the component parts of the rods remained, though the form was changed; this was not a miracle but an artificial operation. The intelligence and active powers of the demon being fully competent to ſuch an operation.

Hence appears the neceſſity of that warning, which Moſes gave the Jews, to beware of impoſtors, whoſe diabolical ſigns, ſurpaſſing the powers of human nature, might induce them to ſwerve from the obedience which they owed their God; in like manner Chriſtians were warned both by Chriſt and his apoſtle to beware of all impoſtors, more particularly that great impoſtor Anti-Chriſt, whoſe prodigies will be according to the extent of Satan's power.

It is ſaid in the book of Kings that Saul applied to the witch of Endor to raiſe Samuel by her incantations. It is true, Samuel appeared to Saul, but not by the witch's incantations, for he appeared before ſhe began them, but by the power of God, who ſent him to

propheſy

propheſy Saul's fate, and the fall of his army, and to reproach him with his diſobedience. This is evident from the whole paſſage, and is confirmed by the authority of Eccleſiaſticus who ſays that Samuel propheſied after his death. Though the demon has no power whatſoever over the ſouls, or bodies of departed ſaints, it is not inconvenient that when the demon was conſulted God himſelf ſhould give an anſwer by one of his prophets, as when the king Ochozias ſent to conſult Beelzebub, the pretended God of Accaron, the prophet Elias was ſent to meet his meſſengers and announce his death.

There are certain rules to diſtinguiſh true, from pretended miracles, which though not within the reach of the ſimple and illiterate parts of ſociety (a ſtrong prejudice againſt our innovators) are yet infallible. The firſt rule. No miracles can be wrought in proof of poſitions contradicting each other, none to invalidate truths already eſtabliſhed by divine authority, becauſe God cannot contradict himſelf, none to eſtabliſh impiety or irreligion: this is inconſiſtent with the ſanctity of God. Second rule. True miracles muſt ſurpaſs the force of mechanical cauſes. Third rule. They muſt be wrought by the invocation of the true God, and in confirmation of ſome truth propoſed by him. The moſt ſimple and at the ſame time the moſt univerſal is a happy combination of circumſtances: if it be manifeſt that the fact has happened; that it ſurpaſſes the known powers of natural agents, and mechanical cauſes; if the inſtrumental cauſe be ſincere, incapable of deceit; if it tends to eſtabliſh piety and ſanctity of morals, and to glorify God; if it be analogus to previous miracles and tending to the ſame end, if it ſuſtains the critical examination of intelligent men. A fact accompanied by all theſe circumſtances is manifeſtly ſupernatural and miraculous. It excites and confirms our belief of revealed

vealed truths: for as by natural effects we arrive at the knowledge of natural truths, ſo by ſupernatural effects, we attain a knowledge of ſupernatural truths. That miracles have been wrought in confirmation of revealed religion is evident from this circumſtance, that in revealed religion there are many ſupernatural truths, as the reſurrection and aſcenſion of Jeſus Chriſt, which could not be impoſed on the credulity of the world but by ſupernatural means: to believe theſe, and other, truths of revealed religion, we muſt believe that miracles were wrought in confirmation of theſe truths, which are themſelves miraculous, and to believe all this without any miracle would be of all miracles the greateſt. But, ſays the Deiſt, Chriſtians now ſee no miracles, and yet they believe all theſe truths. It is true they ſee no miracles in themſelves, but they ſee them in their effects; and the Deiſt muſt be miſerably blind, if he does not ſee them alſo: for there is no effect without a cauſe, and to pretend that ſo many nations renounced the Heathen ſuperſtitions, which flattered all their paſſions, to embrace a religion ſevere in its maxims, full of reſtraints, contradicting all the inclinations of man, and in which there are ſo many myſterious and miraculous truths propoſed, without having ſeen a miracle at all, is to believe a moſt extraordinary effect without any cauſe.

Miracles may be wrought by vicious men in confirmation of truth, not in confirmation of that ſanctity, which they do not poſſeſs: for though faith not animated by charity be dead, it may yet be an inſtrument to a living power to produce any effect, as a man makes uſe of an axe. God may therefore confirm truths of faith at the invocation of a vicious man, but not that ſanctity which the man has not, becauſe God cannot atteſt a falſhood.

In reply to a number of impertinent queſtions ſuch

as theſe : why ſhould God ſuſpend the phyſical laws which he has eſtabliſhed ? Why work great miracles upon trifling occaſions without a great neceſſity ? Why ſo many repeated miracles to eſtablish the ſame truth, as in the caſe of Balaam, of Gideon, of Elias, of Eliſha, of Ezechias ? It muſt be obſerved that God in the creation of the world could have no other object in view, but the manifeſtation of his power, his wiſdom, his goodneſs, &c. to intelligent Beings from whom, he could exact his tribute of glory ; that matter in this viſible world is incapable of good or evil, of pleaſure or pain, of perfection or imperfection : the poliſhed diamond derives its value from uſe or fancy : in itſelf it is inert matter, as is the unpoliſhed pebble. The earth, the ſea, the ſun, the moon, all the Heavenly bodies, compoſed of matter are incapable of contemplating any of God's works, or paying him any tribute of glory ; they muſt therefore have been created for intelligent Beings, as a mean to attain the end which God had in view in the creation of the whole ; the abſolute and relative poſition of all theſe bodies, and the mechanical laws, to which they are ſubſervient, muſt have been eſtabliſhed for the ſame end, hence if the perfection of many, or even of one intelligent Being, required a deviation from one or more of theſe laws, it was perfectly conſiſtent with the original plan of the Creator to pre-diſpoſe ſuch deviation for the ſtated time. Why ſo ? Becauſe one intelligent Being is ſuperior to the whole maſs of inanimate matter, and all the claſſes of irrational creatures. And ſince the perfection of intelligent Beings conſiſts in moral rectitude, and intellectual excellence, if this end be not attainable but by a deviation from accuſtomed phyſical laws, the deviation muſt have been predisposed in the plan of the Creator. That miracle appears great to us, which far ſurpaſſes the power of viſible

viſible agents, to almighty power all miracles are equal: no miracle is great when omnipotence is the agent; to open the Red Sea, to ſuſpend the motion of the earth or moon, to raiſe the dead, to exterminate all the inhabitants of the earth by water, or fire, is not an effort of power for him, who by an act of his will gave exiſtence to all the Beings, which compoſe the univerſe.

The effect of repeated miracles at the inſtance of Gideon, of miracles, which God wrought for the immediate relief of his ſervants, as the feeding of Elias by a raven in the wilderneſs, the cauſing the borrowed axe to ſwim, at the prayer of Eliſha, of the ſign given to Ezechias, of the many miracles in favor of Tobias, Daniel and others, was not confined to them: there have been, are, and will be millions, who believing theſe miracles, praiſe and glorify a God ſo bountiful, ſo condeſcending, ſo attentive to the wants of his ſervants. If the Atheiſt rejects theſe facts, as ſuppoſed, it is becauſe he does not believe the author to exiſt; if the Deiſt refuſe his aſſent it is becauſe, that God whom his corrupt life diſhonors, and his impious tongue blaſphemes, has in puniſhment of his crimes withdrawn the light of his underſtanding and abandoned him to a reprobate ſenſe.

The miracles related of Balaam were wrought on him, not by him, he was the ſubject, not the inſtrumental cauſe; they have the ſame tendency with the other miracles related by Moſes to eſtabliſh the truth of revealed religion, moral rectitude, intellectual excellence; the perfection of man, the great end of the creation.

Propheſy is of all proofs the moſt unequivocal, and leaſt liable to objection. That future events may be known was univerſally believed by the Heathen nations, hence their augurs and ſoothſayers were in great repute

repute, and their oracles were religiouſly conſulted. But as all future events dependent on indetermined cauſes eſcape the knowledge of limited intelligence, their knowledge was merely conjectural, and their oracles equivocal. There is but God, whoſe infinite underſtanding ſees the order of all cauſes to their effects, and conſequently all future events in their cauſes, as alſo in themſelves, who can announce with the utmoſt certainty a future event depending on the combination of an indefinite number of free and concurring cauſes. Iſaias ſpeaking of idols ſays "tell us future events, and we ſhall know that you are Gods."

This knowledge of future events, called propheſy, conſiſts in ſome ſupernatural illumination of the mind, on which truths, to which human knowledge does not extend, are impreſſed. As truth conveyed from the teacher to the diſciple is the ſame in both, propheſy being impreſſed on the mind of the Prophet by primary truth, is infallible.

Truths remote from the knowledge of one man, though known to others, may be known by the ſpirit of propheſy; truths intelligible in themſelves, but not to the limited underſtanding of man, may alſo be known, as the myſteries of religion, and truths entirely remote from the knowledge of all creatures, becauſe they are not intelligible in themſelves, as future contingencies dependent on the free determinations of man, may be known by the ſpirit of propheſy, theſe are more properly its object.

There is no limited underſtanding which knows the order of indetermined cauſes to their effects, conſequently no limited underſtanding, which can foretel an event depending on the combination of ſuch cauſes, the ſpirit of propheſy is not therefore natural either to men or angels; but God being the firſt author of all Beings muſt know them before they have an exiſtence, he

he therefore knows all future events and he alone can foretel them.

To pretend that God cannot inſtruct the Prophet in truths, to which his underſtanding cannot naturally extend, is abſurd : there is nothing more common than to ſee one man teach another truths, of which by any exertion of his mind unaſſiſted, he never could have formed an idea, though the teacher can do no more than to convey ſome image by ſounds, or ſigns, without infuſing any light in his underſtanding, whilſt the Almighty God not only enlightens the underſtanding, but increaſes its powers of action, at the ſame time that he conveys the images.

An angel either of light, or darkneſs, from its ſuperior ſagacity, and more extenſive knowledge, combining circumſtances, may form a ſtrong conjecture of ſome future event not far diſtant, but uncertainty is eſſential to conjecture, there is but infinite ſagacity, and unlimited knowledge, which excludes conjecture.

In vain does the Deiſt think that becauſe ſome events were foretold, or rather threatened in the ſcriptures, which did not happen, as the death of Ezechias, and the deſtruction of Nineveh, that theſe were merely conjectural, and all others of the ſame nature. God ſees all future events in themſelves, as they depend on him for their futurity, and he alſo ſees the order of all cauſes to their effects, and knows whether theſe effects will be produced, or prevented by other cauſes. He ſaw that the diſpoſition of Ezechias's body was tending to a diſſolution, this truth he impreſſed on the mind of the Prophet, he ſaw at the ſame time, that in conſequence of Ezechias's prayer, his death would be poſtponed for fifteen years, this he did not at that time communicate, he did after ; the ſame reaſoning is applicable to all menaces in the ſcripture : they

are

are all conditional, whether the condition be expreſſed or implied. The crimes of Nineveh deſerved the deſtruction of the city, the penance of its inhabitants ſaved it. The Ninevites underſtood the propheſy in its true ſenſe as a menace.

It is true, in many propheſies of the Old Teſtament there is great obſcurity, and in ſome, ſeeming contradictions, more particularly theſe which regard the Meſſias, whoſe power and glory is announced in ſtrong imagery, and whoſe humiliations and ſufferings is related in the moſt pathetic manner. Power, majeſty, and glory, humiliations, ſufferings and death, muſt have appeared to the Jews inconſiſtent in the ſame perſon, and would have been ſo in fact, if in one perſon the Meſſias had not united the divine and human nature. Another cauſe of obſcurity was that, at the ſame time, events ages diſtant, one from the other, were foretold, as if they were to happen at the ſame time: thus the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and the conſummation of the world ſeem confounded. Many things are ſaid of Antiochus, which are applicable to Anti-Chriſt, of whom that tyrant was an image, or, if you will, a figure; moreover the total ruin and deſtruction of the Jewiſh nation, their rejection and the aſſumption of the Heathen nations was foretold, obſcurity was indiſpenſably neceſſary, or they would have not only murdered the Prophets as they did, but alſo deſtroyed the ſcriptures. However there are in the Old Teſtament many propheſies as intelligible as language can make them.

By propheſy, as by miracles, our faith is confirmed: it is natural to man to reaſon from effects to cauſes, if the effect be ſupernatural, the cauſe muſt be ſo too, otherwiſe it might be ſaid that a natural cauſe had produced a ſupernatural effect, which is abſurd in the extreme. Propheſy is manifeſtly ſupernatural; to foretel a future event at a diſtant period of time, refuſing

ing from different combinations of an indefinite number of free and concurring causes, surpasses all the powers of nature.

Prophesy is more effectual to confirm the truth of revelation than miracles. Why so? Because a miracle is but a momentary suspension of the established order, and may be eluded by ascribing it to magic, or some occult causes, but prophesy is permanent and can be ascribed to no power inferior to the divine. Hence that invincible argument of the apologists of the Christian religion against the Heathen philosophers, who admitting the miracles of Christ and his apostles upon incontrovertible evidence, ascribed them to the powers of Satan. Was Christ, said the apologists, a magician before he was born, to foretel all the circumstances of his life, or was it in the power of a magician to foretel what has happened since his death? To the evidence of this argument there is no reply, nor can the force of it be eluded.

To determine, says the Deist, if any religion be founded on revelation, it is necessary to examine minutely the tenets of all the different religions, which contradict each other, and pretend to miracles, such an examination requires a length of time, intense study, a knowledge of many, if not all different languages, an intimate acquaintance with the inhabitants of all different countries, a toil of which few, if any, are capable, and to which none will submit. This argument is inconteſtible against the Deist, who believes nothing but on the testimony of his eyes, or ears, so far from having any force against the Christian it goes directly to shew the necessity of revelation; since reason unassisted by it, is incapable of conducting a man to his last end. It is not necessary for the Christian to institute this examination, or to wander through different nations: the truths of revealed religion are found in that

that revelation, and that they have been revealed is a fact, of which there is moral evidence capable of convincing any man, who reasons; that there can be no contrary revelation is evident from this simple principle, that God cannot contradict himself, it is useless to visit foreign countries to know if that does exist, which cannot exist, he might as well enquire if bread which nourishes in his own country, poisons elsewhere, or if dogs which run in England fly in Spain.

It is not inconvenient that the prophetic spirit as well as the power of working miracles may be sometimes given to the vicious: both the one and the other being intended for the public good, and a man however vicious may be an instrument to serve others as a charitable master gives alms by the ministry of an impious servant. Sensuality seems inconsistent with the spirit of prophesy: because it absorbs the mind, and renders it subservient to the flesh, other vices of a spiritual nature, as ambition, vain glory, &c. are not so opposite.

If the spirit of prophesy be intended to illustrate the understanding of the Prophet, as also to inform the public it does not rest on immoral characters: habitual grace, which is not granted to immoral men, enlightens the understanding; actual graces only excite and are transitory.

We come now to enquire, if any revelation be contained in the books of the Old Testament? If the motives of credibility be sufficient to induce a well-founded belief, that a revelation was made; and that this revelation is in the whole, or in part, contained in the books of the Old Testament? Whether the truths revealed be consistent with our notions, or surpass the powers of our understanding, is useless to enquire: because there are two truths evident to the meanest capacity: that God can neither deceive, nor be deceived is one; and

that,

that, in the range of infinity, there are numberleſs truths, to which the human mind cannot extend is another; any one therefore of theſe truths may be revealed by God, who perfectly knows them all. In a word, the leaſt homage we can pay the almighty power of God is, to admit that he can do, what we cannot conceive. It is the ſummit of pride, to pretend to bound the power of God by our conceptions.

That there did exiſt ſome ages ago a nation of Jews is univerſally admitted; that the nation poſſeſſed books, which they believed to be written by men inſpired is equally certain; they yet exiſt and they yet believe their ſcriptures divinely inſpired, though theſe very ſcriptures contain the moſt ſevere ſtrictures on the conduct of their anceſtors, and the moſt dreadful menaces againſt themſelves. In theſe ſcriptures are contained the moſt ſublime ideas of the Divinity, and of all the attributes of the Deity known to us; they alſo contain rules of moral conduct ſuperior to all that the Heathen philoſophers imagined: in conduct theſe philoſophers reſembled their children of the preſent day, they were more reſerved in their writings. This Jewiſh nation firmly believed that their anceſtors had been for ſome centuries in aſtate of ſlavery in Egypt; that Moſes had been expreſsly ſent to deliver them from their captivity; and the very laws delivered by Moſes were the public laws of the nation, all cauſes civil, criminal, religious and matrimonial, were decided according to theſe laws.

This law of Moſes, or, if you will, the books in which it is contained, have ſuch internal marks of the divinity of its origin, that there is but the moſt blind ſtupidity, or perverſe obſtinacy, that can reſiſt them. Language cannot afford terms more ſtrong than theſe, by which he expreſſes the eternity, the wiſdom, the power, the immutability, the independence and the ſelf-

exiſtence of the Divinity, *Jehova* ſignifying a Being which poſſeſſes independent exiſtence, the incommunicable name of God. *Elohim* indicates his judicial power and the ſovereignty of his Being. *El* conveys a particular idea of the power of God. *El Sabaoth* the God of armies on whom the event of battles depends. *El Sadi* the all-powerful Being. The truth the juſtice the ſanctity of God in theſe terms of Deut. 32. C. 4. v, " God's works are perfect, all his ways are judgments: God is faithful without any iniquity, juſt, and upright." The unity, the power, the providence of God in theſe terms. V. 19, " See that I am alone, and there is no other God beſide me: I will kill, and enliven, I will ſtrike and I will heal, and there is none who can reſt out of my hand." In the original tex, *I, I am he*, there is no God with me. *Ani ani hou ve ein elohim imadi.*

In this law, the moſt pious, the moſt tender ſentiments of devotion are inculcated, the fear of a God the avenger of crimes; the reverence due to Sovereign Majeſty; the boundleſs confidence to be placed in the power and goodneſs of God are propoſed in expreſſive terms. Deut. 6. C. 5 v, " Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and thy whole ſoul, and with thy whole ſtrength. Theſe things, which I now command, will be in your heart, and you will tell them to your children, you will meditate on them ſitting in your houſe, and walking in the way, lying and riſing." And Deut. 10. C. 12. v, " And now, O Iſrael, what is it that the Lord your God requires of you, but that you ſhould fear the Lord your God and walk in his ways, that you ſhould love him, and ſerve the Lord your God, with your whole heart and ſoul; that you ſhould obſerve the precepts of the Lord and his ceremonies, which I this day command you, that it may be well with you ..... Do not harden your necks

more

more: becauſe the Lord your God is the God of Gods and the Lord of Lords, a God great, and powerful, and terrible, he accepts neither perſons nor gifts ..... The Lord your God you ſhall fear, and him alone ſhall you ſerve..... He is your praiſe and your God, who has done for you theſe great and terrible things, which your eyes have ſeen." The 32 C. 3. v, " Give Glory to your God. God's works are perfect and all his ways are judgments."

In this law, the moſt ſublime perfection of man is recommended and ſtrictly enjoined. Deut. 18. C. 13. v, " You ſhall be perfect and ſpotleſs with the Lord your God." And, Levi. 19. C. 2. v, " Be you holy becauſe I am holy, the Lord your God."

In the external rites and ſacrifices, which were ordered, the greateſt purity both of ſoul and body was ſtrictly enforced; all ſuperſtitious rites, and ſacrifices to idols, forbidden under the moſt ſevere penalties.

The moral precepts of that law enforce every ſocial virtue and prohibit every vice: " Thou ſhalt love thy neighbour as thyſelf." This precept is frequently repeated in the law of Moſes. Exod. 20. C. 17. v, " Thou ſhalt not covet thy neighbour's houſe, thou ſhalt not deſire his wife, nor his ſervant, nor his maid, nor his ox, nor his aſs, nor any thing which is his." Moſes did not confine himſelf to theſe general precepts, but to obviate theſe difficulties, and prevent falſe interpretations, he deſcends to the moſt minute particulars. Levit. 19. C, " Let every one fear his father and his mother. ..... When you reap your ſtanding corn you will not cut to the very ſurface of the earth, nor will you collect the remaining ears, nor will you collect the bunches, which remain in your vineyard, nor the grains which fall, you will leave them for the poor and for ſtrangers. I am the Lord your God; you will not ſteal, you will not lie, you will not deceive your

neighbour

neighbour. . . . . You will not calumniate your neighbour, nor oppreſs him. The labour of the mercenary will not remain with you until morning. You will not curſe the deaf, nor place a ſtumbling block before the blind. You will not do what is injuſt, nor will you judge againſt equity, you will not conſider the perſon of the poor, nor honor the countenance of the rich. You will judge juſtly. You will not be an informer nor tale bearer amongſt the people. You will not ſtand againſt the blood of your neighbour. You will not hate your brother in your heart, but publicly reprimand him. You will not ſeek revenge nor will you be mindful of an injury from your fellow-citizens, you ſhall love your friend as yourſelf, I am the Lord." Again in the book of Deut. C. 22. v. 1, and ſeq. "You will not ſee your brother's ox or his ſheep ſtraying and paſs it by, but you will bring it back to your brother; if your brother be not near, and that you do not know him, you will bring them to your houſe, and they will remain with you, whilſt your brother ſeeks them, and he will receive them. You will do ſo with his aſs, with his garment, with every thing, which your brother may loſe, if you find it, you will not neglect it, as if not pertaining to you. If you ſee your brother's aſs or ox fall in the way, you will not paſs by, but aſſiſt him to lift it." . . . . .

Is this the language of an impoſtor? What man, who has any remains of reaſon, can think him an impoſtor, who thus enforces the fear, the love, the reverence of Sovereign Majeſty, and all the virtues, which make man great and good? Such an impoſtor would be a more extraordinary character than Moſes himſelf.

The writer paſſes unnoticed the errors of all the Heathen philoſophers, and the abſurdities of the different ſyſtems of religion, which prevailed, and continue to prevail in all theſe unfortunate countries, which

which revelation has not enlightened, or which have perverted revelation to their own deſtruction.

Moſes deſcribes the creation in the moſt ſimple and ſatisfactory manner: " in the beginning God made the heavens and the earth." He then proceeds to relate the formation of certain parts, as the ſun, the ſtars, the formation of the firſt man and his aſſiſtant the firſt woman in a moſt beautiful garden. Their diſobedience to the precept of the Creator and the fatal conſequences of that diſobedience to them, and all their poſterity.

As the angels make a part of the univerſe, not a ſeparate univerſe, they were created at the ſame time with the material world. The ruin of ſome we know from revelation; and the perſeverance of others in their obedience and conſequent exaltation to glory. Why that angel of darkneſs called Satan, the adverſary, was permitted to tempt our firſt parents is a ſecret known to God, not to us, why in particular that diſobedient Spirit was permitted to make the ſerpent the inſtrument of his malice is equally unknown to us; the fact we know, and its effects we feel.

It has been aſſerted by ſome, that the immortality of the ſoul was not known to the Jews before the captivity of Babylon, becauſe Moſes does not ſpeak of an after life. Never was aſſertion more groundleſs: Moſes might have paſſed it unnoticed as a truth publicly known by all. It is not neceſſay to tell a man it is day, when he ſees the ſun ſhine. Yet he did not: God ſays to him, I am the God of Abraham, of Iſaac, and of Jacob. Theſe patriarchs were therefore in exiſtence, for he is not the God of non-exiſting Beings; not their bodies: they were crumbled to aſhes, and, if entire, God would not have called himſelf the God of the dead, their ſouls therefore muſt have been living. And when the patriarch Jacob was told that his ſon Joſeph

was

was devoured by a wild beaſt, " I will," ſaid he, " deſcend to him with ſorrow." *Sheolah.* That is to the peace of ſouls. *Queber* in that language ſignifies a grave, in which he could not think that Joſeph's body was laid, as he thought him devoured by a wild beaſt. And what ſignifies that ſentence ſo often repeated at the deaths of the patriarchs : " He was gathered to his fathers?" Can it imply any thing elſe but that their ſouls were all collected, their bodies certainly were not: Abraham was buried in Ephron's field in the land of Canaan and his anceſtors in Chaldea.

It is true Moſes propoſed temporal rewards and puniſhments to ſanction the law. Theſe were better proportioned to the obſtinate, and perverſe diſpoſition of a great majority of the Jews, as in ſpeculative truths the means of demonſtration ought always to be proportioned to the underſtanding of the learner. Moreover the Jewiſh law was but preparatory to the Chriſtian law, which was to give it its ultimate perfection, and in which rewards and puniſhments are propoſed proportioned to its perfection, that is, Eternal. In all the books of the Old Teſtament the immortality of the ſoul is ſuppoſed as a truth, of which there was no doubt. It is ſaid that Eſau's wife afflicted the ſpirit, *Rouach* of Iſaac and Rebecca. Saul deſires that Samuel might appear to him. The prophets ſpeak of the happineſs which the juſt will enjoy in a future life and the torments of the wicked. In a word, to pretend that the Jews did not believe a future life argues an intolerable ignorance of their hiſtory. The aſſertion deſerves contempt not a ſerious refutation.

From the order which Abraham received to ſacrifice his ſon Iſaac and the actual ſacrifice of Jephta's daughter; as alſo of the death of Agag by the hands of Samuel in preſence of the Lord, it would ſeem that human ſacrifices were authoriſed by the law, more particularly

cularly, as it is ſaid in Levit. 27. C. 28. and 29. v, That whatever is conſecrated to the Lord, whether man, animal or field, ſhall not be redeemed..... That every thing ſo conſecrated ſhall die. Notwithſtanding theſe ſeeming difficulties there is nothing ſo ſtrictly prohibited in the law as human ſacrifices. Deut. 12. C. 30. v. and ſeq. " Take care not to imitate them (the Canaanites) " they have committed all the abominations which the Lord deteſts, offering their ſons and their daughters to their Gods, and burning them with fire.

With reſpect to Abraham, his obedience, by an immediate compliance with a precept ſo difficult, was made known to the world, and his faith : " for he hoped even againſt hope," ſays the apoſtle to the Hebrews " knowing that God was able to raiſe from the dead." Theſe his virtues are propoſed as models, and the ſacrifice of his ſon was not permitted.

Jephta's vow was indiſcreet, and precipitate, and the obſervance of it, if he in reality put his daughter to death, which ſeems extremely probable, a deteſtable act. It is thought by ſome that he only condemned her to perpetual celibacy, which in them times was an uncommon ſacrifice. Be that as it will, the ſcripture relates the fact, as it does the murder of Uriah after the ſeduction of his wife, the ſcandalous multiplication of Solomon's wives and concubines, and ſeveral other facts, which it ſometimes ſeverely cenſures, but never approves, though the authors are for other reaſons highly approved.

Samuel put Agag to death, whether by his own hand, or the hands of others is uſeleſs to enquire : he was ordered by Agag's natural Judge, who had juſtly condemned him : he did not ſacrifice him for Samuel was not one of the prieſtly tribe ; but as that tyrant's ſword had made many a childleſs widow he put him to death in an exemplary manner.

In

In the 27. C. of Levi. there is a diſtinction made between things which were offered to God according to the mode of devoting them. If they were offered by a ſimple vow *Neder*, they were redeemable, if by an abſolute conſecration *cherem* they could not be redeemed. Animals uſed in ſacrifice were ſacrificed without redemption, others were confined to the ſervice of the temple, men thus conſeerated were conſidered as dead in the ſame manner that houſes and lands were, becauſe the men could never be ſet at liberty, nor the houſes or lands return to their former proprietors. In our law language they were in mortmain.

It has been ſtated by ſome writers that the Iſraelites were guilty of an act of injuſtice in borrowing gold and ſilver veſſels and other things from the Egyptians on the eve of their departure. It might be ſaid with equal propriety, that the creditor, who by ſentence of a Court, takes a debtor's moveables in payment of a juſt demand is guilty of injuſtice: the children of Jacob had been reduced to a ſtate of ſlavery without cauſe; obliged to labour without reward, and all the fruits of their labours were taken by the Egyptians; God, the natural Judge of both nations, had ordered payment in that manner. The ſentence was perfectly juſt, and the execution free from blame; God as Sovereign Lord and diſpoſer of all things might have transferred the right of property from the Egyptians to the Iſraelites, and his order is the beſt of all poſſible titles.

The ſublime morality of the old law ſhews the divinity of its author. In the ceremonial law there is nothing reprehenſible: it was adapted to the natural diſpoſition of the people. They were extremely prone to idolatry at all times. When Moſes delayed a few days on the mountain, they made a molten calf, the idol which

which the Egyptians adored, and reſolved to return to Egypt under its protection. Exodus 32. C. 1 v, "Riſe, ſaid they, to Aaron, make us Gods to conduct us." ..... And on the borders of Canaan they formed the ſame project. Numbers 14. C. 3. v, "Is it not better to return to Egypt?" V. 4, "They ſaid one to the other let us appoint a leader and return to Egypt." In the land of Canaan they were always addicted to idolatry: Joſhua when dying reproached them with it. Joſhua 24. C. 14. v, "Now therefore fear the Lord and take away the Gods, which your fathers ſerved in Meſopotamia and Egypt." It is manifeſt from the prophet Ezechial, C. 20. that a ſtrong propenſity to idolatry always ſubſiſted amongſt the Jews, v. 31, "You are defiled in all your idols until this day." The ceremonial law was well calculated to check this propenſity. In this law were marked with the greateſt accuracy the ſacrifices, by which they were to acknowledge the ſupreme dominion of God over all his creatures, and their entire dependence on him; the tabernacle and ſacred veſſels ſolely appropriated to the divine worſhip, were capable of inſpiring a due reſpect and veneration for the Divinity, and their different ſacraments, by which they themſelves were conſecrated to the ſervices of God, and their prieſts in a particular manner, as the public miniſters of the eſtabliſhed worſhip, were well adapted to excite and ſupport the ſpirit of piety and devotion. And from this conſecration to the ſervice of the Divinity, it was neceſſary that in their manners and cuſtoms they ſhould be diſtinguiſhed from the Heathen nations, amongſt whom they were at times obliged to live, hence the diſtinction between clean and unclean animals in their food, and ſome other things in their dreſs. As to their ſacrifices, no religion either true or falſe can exiſt without a ſacrifice: it is that act of re-

ligion by which a man offering to his God, a part of his poſſeſſions, publicly acknowledges by this oblation, that he himſelf and all that he poſſeſſes is from God ; that God is his firſt principle and laſt end Add to this that the ſacrifices ordered in the old law were figurative of the great ſacrifice of the new law, and from their variety and multiplicity they ſerved as barriers againſt the many different ſpecies of idolatry, and ſuperſtition, to which that people was addicted. It is true that in many of the ceremonial precepts of the old law, the reaſon on which the precept is founded, does not immediately appear, becauſe the ceremony itſelf may have but a figurative ſignification and conſequently is not founded on any immediate reaſon in itſelf. This is the great advantage of the new law, that all its precepts are rational, and that the reaſon of the precepts immediately appears. Hence St. Paul to the Romans, 12. C. 1. v, calls our obedience rational. And St. Peter, 1. Epiſt. C. 2. v. 2, ſays, " Like new born children deſire rational milk," as if he had ſaid, having by your profeſſion abjured the Heathen rites, which are falſe and ſuperſtitious, and the Jewiſh ceremonies which were merely figurative, confine your thoughts and deſires to the Chriſtian law, all the precepts of which are evidently founded on reaſon.

That the Jewiſh ceremonies were eſſentially different from the Heathen rites is evident from this, that God ſtrictly forbid them to imitate the Heathen nations in their mode of worſhip. Deut. 12. C, " Take care that you do not imitate theſe nations which are ſubverted before you ; that you do not learn their ceremonies, ſaying, as theſe nations worſhipped their Gods ſo will I worſhip, you will not do ſo to the Lord your God : for all the abominations, which God hates they done for their Gods, offering their ſons and their daughters and burning them with fire. What I command,

mand, that only will you do for the Lord : you ſhall neither add nor diminiſh." And Levit. 18. C, " I am the Lord your God. You ſhall not do according to the cuſtom of the land of Egypt, in which you have dwelt, nor according to the cuſtom of the land of Canaan, into which I am going to introduce you." When therefore St. Paul ſays, Acts 13. C. v. 18, " That God ſupported the manners of the Children of Iſrael forty years in the deſart." He does not pretend that God permitted them to worſhip him, as the Heathens worſhipped their idols, but he commends the patience of God in their frequent revolts to idolatry, their continual infractions of the divine law, and their murmurs againſt himſelf and Moſes. " The houſe of Iſrael irritated me in the wilderneſs," ſaid the Lord by Ezechial, C. 20, " They did not walk in my precepts . . . . . : and my eye ſpared them." Nor did the Apoſtle pretend, when he ſaid to the Galatians, C. 4. v. 3, " We were under the elements of the world," that the Jews had ſacrifices and ceremonies of the ſame nature with the Gentiles, but that they were under the law, which promiſed temporal rewards to obedience, and threatened diſobedience with temporal puniſhments. Whenever any ſcience is to be taught, the elements are firſt propoſed, hence the law was called by the Apoſtle a pedagogue becauſe it ſhewed the way to Chriſt. The elements of the world, under which the Jews were, may be conſidered as theſe corporal, external and figurative rites and ceremonies, as their new moons, their ſabbaths, &c. with this eſſential difference between them and the Heathens, that the Jews ſerved God under theſe elements of the world according to his orders, and the Heathens ſerved theſe elements contrary to the expreſs command of God, and the voice of reaſon.

It is not neceſſary to take a view of the judicial law of Moſes : it is univerſally admitted that there never was

a code of laws ſo ſimple, ſo wiſe, ſo equitable, ſo few in number, and which ſo effectually provides for every poſſible caſe. All the different relations of man are foreſeen, and rules of action preſcribed; for the Prince, for his Judges, for ſubjects, as ſuch, as members of ſociety, as fathers, as huſbands, as friends, as enemies, as maſters, as ſervants, as acquiring, poſſeſſing, and diſpoſing of real, or perſonal property; puniſhments are exactly proportioned to the enormity of offences, not to be inflicted but by order of the public magiſtrate on conviction of the criminal, no torture admitted, no confeſſion extorted, no diſcretionary powers veſted in the magiſtrate, his authority clearly defined, private revenge ſtrictly prohibited, equal juſtice ordered for the ſtranger as the native, for the poor as the rich. Natural enemies as the Moabites and Amonites for ever excluded from the public Councils, to prevent the fatal conſequences of their innate animoſity, though admitted to a participation of the public worſhip leaſt it ſhould be thought that they were excluded from ſalvation; more friendly nations, as the Egyptians, and the Children of Eſau, to be admitted not only to a ſhare of the public worſhip, but into the Councils of the nation at the third generation. Marriages with idolatrous women forbidden, more particularly with the Canaanites, and others, who were obſtinately attached to idolatrous ſuperſtition, and from whom the danger of ſeduction was greater, marriages with other ſtrangers was allowed and indeed with all, in caſe they abjured idolatry and conformed to the Jewiſh worſhip.

The writer paſſes unnoticed the ſilly arguments of ſome modern writers, who through the vanity of appearing well verſed in the ſcriptures, which they never read, and which if they did they cannot underſtand, take from the writings of men of real ſcience certain objections, which are propoſed and ſolved by the authors

for

for the ſake of elucidation, and propoſe them to ignorant people as the fruits of their own deep reſearches. If men of ſcience ſhewed a proper contempt of ſuch ſcribblers, it might check their vanity, and though they themſelves may be incurable, it might reſtrain others from imitating them; but when a man aſſuming the title of Prelate undertakes to give an anſwer, to a low, ignorant and ſcurrillous buffoon, it ſtamps a ſort of reſpectability on the blockhead, feeds his vanity, and encourages him to continue.

We are now to enquire whether the old law w of divine inſtitution atteſted by miraculous works, that is, whether Moſes and Joſhua wrought miracles in confirmation of the truths, which they taught or not. It may not be amiſs previouſly to examine the force of theſe motives of credibility, on which opinions are founded, and alſo theſe motives, which extort the aſſent of the underſtanding.

The affections of the mind are known by the impreſſion, which reſults from them, and is abſolutely inſeparable from them: they are of two kinds: theſe which have no reference to external objects, as joy and ſadneſs, theſe are, by logicians, called paſſions; and theſe, which have an immediate reference to ſome external object, and are conveyed to the mind through the organs of ſenſe, as the impreſſion of ſounds, of colours, &c. theſe are called ſenſations. Theſe latter infallibly atteſt the ſtate of the mind, but the judgment, which is formed of the external object, in conſequence of the impreſſion on the mind, may be falſe. Thus, though a man at a diſtance may miſtake a ſheep for a dog, he cannot miſtake that the object has made an impreſſion on his mind; the miſtake lies in attributing the impreſſion to a dog which is an imaginary object, not to the ſheep which is the real object.

Truth in general conſiſts in the agreement of the attribute

tribute of any propoſition with its ſubject. Thus, in this propoſition, " *man is mortal*," the idea of mortality, the attribute of the propoſition, is perfectly conſiſtent with the idea of man, which is the ſubject of the propoſition ; and of courſe falſhood, which is the negation of truth, is manifeſt from the diſagreement of theſe ideas. Thus, this propoſition, " *a man is a horſe*," is manifeſtly falſe, becauſe the idea of a horſe does not coincide with that of a man. Evidence conſiſts in a clear perception of the agreement of theſe ideas. That propoſition is evidently true, in which the idea of the attribute is clearly perceived to be conſiſtent with the idea of the ſubject. As this propoſition, " *God is immortal.*" And that propoſition is evidently falſe, in which the idea of the ſubject excludes that of the attribute, as this propoſition " *God is mortal*," hence all judgments founded on evidence are infallibly true ; errors are founded, not on evidence, but on the ſuppoſition of evidence : thus a man thinks a propoſition evidently true though he has not a clear perception of the ſubject or attribute of the propoſition and conſequently cannot determine whether they agree or diſagree, the aſſertion may be true, but made by him it is a mere conjectural opinion.

There are many truths, which, though not founded on evidence, are evidently credible. Thus for example, " London is a capital city." The propoſition is not evident, but it is evidently credible becauſe it is founded on the teſtimony of many witneſſes. Truths like this, which are founded on the teſtimony of man, are ſaid to have moral evidence.

Truths founded on the mechanical laws, by which the material world is governed, are ſaid to have phyſical evidence, thus, by the law of gravitation, a ſtone, if not ſupported, will fall towards the attracting centre. From the interference of either viſible, or inviſible agents, temporary ſuſpenſions of ſome mechanical laws may be effected. That

That there are bodies, and many in the material world, though not evident, is evidently credible: no man ever ſeriouſly diſbelieved it: the arguments offered by ſome writers againſt the exiſtence of bodies, only argue the vanity of the men, affecting to acquire fame by the ſingularity of their opinions. All men naturally believe that there are bodies, this judgment is the natural effect of the impreſſions on their minds through the organs of ſenſe; and as God is the author of this impreſſion, he is alſo the author of the judgment neceſſarily connected with it. To pretend that he is the author of falſhood is blaſphemy.

The certainty of any propoſition depends on its connection with the motive, which induces a belief of the propoſition: to put the propoſition beyond all doubt, the motive, which induces the belief, muſt be infallible in itſelf, and manifeſtly connected with the propoſition.

Propoſitions founded on evidence are ſaid to be metaphyſically certain.

Propoſitions founded on the mechanical laws are ſaid to be phyſically certain.

And theſe depending on the teſtimony of man are ſaid to be morally certain.

The intelligent world is ſubject to certain general laws, as the material world is, with this difference, that in the material world all the Beings, which compoſe it, are blind cauſes, and are of courſe determined to produce their effects by the prime mover; their effects in ſimilar circumſtances are invariably the ſame; they are ſaid to be under a phyſical neceſſity; intelligent cauſes have, within themſelves, a power of determination, they do not at all times act according to the whole force of agency, or power of action, which they poſſeſs, as the former do, hence, though in ſimilar circumſtances they do not always produce ſimilar effects; yet there

there are certain general rules, which they invariably obſerve, in theſe caſes they are ſaid to be under a moral neceſſity. Thus, it is morally certain that a prudent ſober man will not murder an only child; indeed it is morally certain, that he will not be guilty of murder at all; it is alſo morally certain that an upright Judge will not, at the loſs of his reputation, pronounce a ſentence manifeſtly contrary to law.

In particular caſes phyſical and moral certainty are nearly of equal force: it is phyſically certain that water in a river will not revert againſt the current, there is a diſtant poſſibility of its being compelled by an inviſible power, there is alſo a diſtant poſſibility of prudence and equity forſaking the upright Judge at that critical juncture, when he pronounces a ſentence manifeſtly iniquitous. There is no probability of either; but the latter is more improbable than the former, becauſe a momentary ſuſpenſion of any mechanical law is not inconſiſtent with any attribute of the Divinity, whereas to concur directly or indirectly to iniquity is incompatible with ſanctity. If then even in particular caſes moral certainty be of greater force than phyſical, there are certain caſes, in which the teſtimony of witneſſes totally invalidates any arguments, which may be drawn from mechanical laws, and amounts to what logicians call a metaphyſical certainty, which is abſolutely incapable of falſhood. Theſe are the caſes in which the teſtimony of witneſſes is indiſpenſably neceſſary for the ſupport of order and the eſtabliſhment of religion, this teſtimony is founded on the laws of Providence, and is warranted by the wiſdom and veracity of God, which can neither deceive nor be deceived.

That moral certainty is founded on the diſpoſition of Providence is manifeſt from this, that ſociety, of which God is the author, and governor, cannot ſubſiſt without it. By the teſtimony of witneſſes we know

our

our Magiſtrates, our ſuperiors, our very parents are not otherwiſe known to us. All the different ſciences are dependent on moral certainty. The mechanic, the chymiſt, the aſtronomer, the navigator, muſt reſt his hopes on the teſtimony of others. There is no mathematical demonſtration, to which the mind of man more firmly adheres, or more readily aſſents, than to this truth, dependent on the teſtimony of witneſſes, that Quebec was taken from the French by Great-Britain. To deny this truth argues ſomething more than ſtupidity, that is a perverſe obſtinacy of the will: hence to reject truths founded on moral evidence is more abſurd, and inexcuſable, than to deny mathematical demonſtration; the latter may be the effect of mere ſtupidity, the former reſults from a depravity of heart.

Againſt a fact founded on moral evidence no metaphyſical arguments are admiſſible. This is an axiom amongſt Philoſophers, becauſe it is impoſſible that a fact ſhould happen and not happen, and it is equally impoſſible that the fact ſhould be morally certain if it did not happen, all reaſoning to the contrary is uſeleſs. Moral evidence therefore cannot be invalidated by any arguments drawn from mechanical laws: a fact cannot be ſupported by moral evidence if it has not happened; and if it has, it is ridiculous to pretend any impoſſibility. To conclude that any fact is founded on moral certainty, we muſt enquire if the fact be poſſible: nothing can induce a wiſe man to aſſent to an impoſſibility; but if neither the poſſibility nor impoſſibility of the fact be manifeſt, from the teſtimony of man we muſt conclude the poſſibility; the ſuſpicion of impoſſibility is not ſufficient to invalidate moral evidence, it only argues the weakneſs of our underſtanding. The fact muſt be related by ſeveral witneſſes, who were not themſelves deceived

nor can any motive be assigned why they should combine or conspire to deceive others. The mere suspicion of a distant possibility of deception is no argument at all. Thus in every individual there is a possibility of deception. He may deceive or he may be deceived, thence to infer that a number of witnesses may be deceived is ridiculous. It is that fallacy which Logicians call a conclusion from a particular to a general sense. As if because a soldier is not able to storm a fort, an army could not do it.

If the fact be momentous, it must be connected with other public facts, and known monuments, admitted by those, who are inimical, or, if contradicted, the variety and futility of their opposition must be shewn; finally, if the fact be of ancient date, it must be transmitted by witnesses in regular succession from the very time the fact has happened, any fact vested with these conditions is incontrovertible. To contradict it argues an insuperable fund of impudence, and to attempt by reasoning to disabuse an ignorant or impudent scribbler is folly. Thus for example, a man who under pretence that ancient facts are not so certain now as they were formerly, would deny the existence of Julius Cæsar, or Alexander the Great, would deserve a place in Bedlam, not a serious refutation. Whilst the motives of credibility continue the same, the certainty is the same, and we at this day are as well assured of the existence of Julius Cæsar as we are of the existence of Bonaparte—on the credit of witnesses we know both the one and the other.

A fact vested with the conditions which have been already marked, must be founded in truth: it cannot be the work of man to deceive the world: no man has any such power, and it is inconsistent with the Divine nature to be the author of universal deception, or even to countenance it, which must be

the

the caſe, if Providence did not furniſh any means of detecting the deceit; it is true, the impreſſion made by any fact is ſtronger on the mind of the ſpectator, than on any other perſon, but the conviction on his underſtanding is equal, the impreſſion of terror, of joy, or any other paſſion, diminiſhes, but the conviction of the fact is unalterable, the impreſſions of terror excited by the cruelty of Nero is effaced, it no longer ſubſiſts; but that Nero was a ſanguinary tyrant is univerſally believed and will until the end of time.

Beſides theſe motives, which exclude a poſſibility of deception, there are many others on which opinions are reaſonably founded. The teſtimony of a man of known probity, who has no motive to deceive, is ſufficient to found a highly probable opinion of any fact. Even the opinions of men of real ſcience, where prejudice does not interfere, have great weight, and if the opinions of many coincide, they form a ſtrong probability of the truth of any aſſertion when the falſehood does not appear. In experimental philoſophy and aſtronomy the opinions of great maſters are ſometimes aſſumed, as principles; nor is any man allowed to deviate from them without aſſigning ſufficient reaſons, the ſame practice is obſerved in courts of law: former deciſions founded on the opinions of men of eminence, ſerve as precedents: the writer paſſes unnoticed theſe opinions, which the unlearned borrow from others without diſcuſſion, of which they are incapable. Theſe reſt ſolely on the authority of the firſt author. If they be inconſiſtent with the received opinions of the public, the preſumption is againſt them, the proof lies on the author, if it appear that prejudice, paſſion, precipitation or intereſt, was the ſpring, or the author's inducement to conteſt the received opinions, the preſumption againſt him amounts

mounts to positive proof. The credit given to such opinions is unwarrantable, and they who adhere to them are inexcusable.

All these judgments, which are founded on motives of probability are but opinions subject to discussion. Judgments founded on motives in themselves certain and manifestly connected with them, are not in the class of opinions, they exclude the possibility of deception, discussion may serve to illustrate but cannot invalidate them.

Having taking this cursory view of the motives which found our unerring judgments, and our opinions subject to error, the writer now proceeds to examine, whether we have motives of credibility sufficiently strong to support a reasonable and well-founded belief that the law of Moses was of Divine Authority; in other words did Moses authenticate his mission? Did he by miraculous works attest and demonstrate to the Children of Israel that he was sent by God? And have we sufficient reason to believe it? Miraculous works are known, as other facts are, by the testimony of their senses to these, who are present; and by the testimony of witnesses to all others. Thus for example, the resurrection of a dead man is known to these who are present by the testimony of their senses. They see the man dead, they feel him cold, they smell the cadaverous odour of putrefaction. The fact is unquestionable; again they see him, at the will of another, rise, they hear him speak, they feel him warm, they converse with him, they eat with him, this fact is equally incontrovertible as the former; that a man who was dead and lives again has been raised from the dead is absolutely certain; and that he could not be raised by any secondary cause, according to any mechanical law, is equally certain: for though Nature may produce life in a fœtus predisposed

diſpoſed according to the eſtabliſhed order, it cannot produce life in a dead body, in which every diſpoſition to life is extinct, and which is tending to putrefaction. The miracle therefore may be conſidered as reſulting from two facts, which are natural, and theſe facts muſt be known, as all others are, by teſtimony.

That Moſes did exiſt; that he conducted the children of Iſrael from Egypt; that he taught the ceremonies and rites of the Jewiſh worſhip; that he aſſumed the whole tribe of Levi as miniſters of religion, and confined the office of high Prieſt to Aaron and his poſterity excluſively, are facts of public notoriety, which the whole Jewiſh nation at all times believed, and which they continue to believe, and which the whole Chriſtian world believes; no fact either ancient or modern is better eſtabliſhed. That he wrought the moſt ſtupendous prodigies in Egypt, and during the ſpace of forty years in the wilderneſs, is believed in the ſame manner, a particular deſcription of theſe prodigies is contained in the very books, which deſcribe the rites and ceremonies of their religion, the public laws of the land, by which all judicial proceedings were determined, the authentic records of all their rights and poſſeſſions; theſe books were written and publiſhed at the very time in preſence of an army of ſix hundred and fifty thouſand fighting men, and an immenſe body of people, who were witneſſes to theſe prodigies, without any contradiction or ſuſpicion of deception; theſe books were then given to the public miniſters of religion, and to all the Elders of Iſrael, with an expreſs order, that on the ſeventh year at the great feſtival of the Tabernacles, when all the people were aſſembled, men, women, and children, they ſhould be read in their hearing, "that," ſaid Moſes, Deut. 31, Chap. "hearing

they

may learn and fear the Lord your God." And as it was impoſſible for Moſes to impoſe on ſuch a body of people, and perſuade them to believe that they had ſeen all the prodigies which were wrought, if they had not ſeen them; that they had ſeen the earth open and devour Cori. Dathan and Abiron, the fire iſſue from the Tabernacle and conſume two hundred and fifty men, the accomplices of their crime, that they themſelves had been forty years in the deſert, that their cloaths were not worn, nor their ſhoes grown old; that they did not eat bread nor drink wine nor beer: Deut. 29 Chap. 1 v. The immenſe number of copies given to the Levites and all the Elders with this order to have them read in preſence of all the people on the ſeventh year precluded every poſſibility of deception and interpolation in future.

A diſſertation on the miracles wrought by Moſes, by Joſhua, and the other Prophets, in defence of each in particular, is totally unneceſſary: they all tend to the ſame end, that is, to eſtabliſh the truths of revealed religion, to inſpire ſublime ideas of the God, whom we adore, and enforce obedience to his precepts. No contradiction, no diſcordance, though wrought at different periods of time, in different countries, and by different men, they have all the ſame tendency; their coincidence forms a ſort of proof againſt which impiety declaims in vain.

That ſome have been deceived is admitted; that ſome impoſtors have ſuppoſed miracles intentionally to deceive others, is equally true; but that of all the miracles related by Moſes and the Prophets not one has been real; that of all theſe Prophets ſo eminent for piety, not one has been ſincere; that all the witneſſes who atteſted, and all the men of ſcience who believed them, have been impoſtors or dupes is an aſſertion, which ſurpaſſes impudence, which no man would dare

dare to make, who has any remains, not ſimply of modeſty, but even of common ſenſe or common honeſty; and if it be admitted that any one of theſe miracles was wrought, impiety falls defenceleſs: becauſe it is impoſſible that God by an immediate effect of his Almighty Power ſhould atteſt a falſehood.

But after all, ſays the Deiſt, if Pharaoh and the Egyptians ſaw the Prodigies wrought by Moſes why did they not believe them? Why did they perſiſt in refuſing to permit the Children of Iſrael to depart?

The ſpirit of intereſt blinded them; the immenſe advantages, which they obtained from the labour and induſtry of a numerous people, which they could not prevail on themſelves to renounce, whilſt there was the moſt diſtant hope or even poſſibility of retaining them. This appears from the ſupplications and promiſes to Moſes during the continuance of the public calamity, and their refuſal to perform theſe promiſes as ſoon as the calamity ceaſed. "I have ſinned," ſaid Pharaoh, "even now, the Lord is juſt; I and my people are impious; pray to the Lord that the thunder and hail may ceaſe," Exodus 9 Chap. 27 and 28 v. Yet after the ceſſation of that terrible plague, the ſpirit of intereſt inducing them to believe that it might have been ſome unuſual accident he refuſed to diſmiſs them. However after the death of the firſt born, "Pharoah calling Moſes and Aaron at night, ſays, ariſe and depart from amongſt my people, you and the Children of Iſrael; go and ſacrifice to your God as you ſay ..... and going bleſs me: the Egyptians preſſed the people to depart quickly, ſaying, we ſhall all die." Chap. 12, v. 31, yet ſo great was the obſtinacy of Pharaoh and his people, and ſuch the blindneſs of underſtanding produced by the ſpirit of intereſt and deſire of domination, that notwithſtanding all the calamities they had endured, when they ſaw the Children

dren of Iſrael on their way, to return no more, they regretted the permiſſion which had been extorted from them. " The King of the Egyptians was told that the people fled, and Pharaoh's heart and the heart of his ſervants was changed, and they ſaid; what have we done to diſmiſs the Children of Iſrael from ſerving us ?" Exodus 14th Chap. 5th v.

The obſtinacy of the Egyptians was not greater than that of our modern Deiſts, who, though they do not ſee theſe prodigies in themſelves, as the Egyptians did, ſee them in their effects, with an additional prodigy, which the Egyptians did not ſee, a prodigy the more capable of convincing the underſtanding, as it is ſubject to no poſſible illuſion, that is, the converſion of the world according to the expreſs prediction of Jeſus Chriſt, and the literal accompliſhment of many other prophecies contained in the New Teſtament, and written at a time when every thing conſpired to extinguiſh Chriſtianity, when the doctrines of Chriſtianity, and Chriſtians themſelves, were in public execration; if then the ſpirit of pride and infidelity, blinds the Deiſt ſo far as to induce him to refuſe his aſſent to truths eſtabliſhed beyond the poſſibility of doubt, by palpable evidence, manifeſt as the Sun at mid-day, why ſhould it appear ſurpriſing, that the ſame ſpirit of infidelity, united to the ſpirit of intereſt, blinded the Egyptians.

To ſuppoſe that natural cauſes, acting according to mechanical laws, could produce the ſtupendous prodigies related in the book of Exodus, and other books of the old law, is ridiculous in the extreme. Moſes lifts up the rod, which he held in his hand and immediately a ſcorching wind blows a whole day and night, and in the morning, the wind collects and brings with it locuſts in ſuch numbers that they covered the ſurface of the ground, deſtroying every thing

thing. Exodus 10. chap. Was the elevation of a rod a ſufficient cauſe to produce ſuch an effect? With the ſame facility, on Pharaoh's promiſe of obedience, a weſterly wind is raiſed, collects all theſe locuſts, and ſweeps them into the Red Sea, not one remaining behind. Are the winds ſubject to man's command? Or how did the wind ſo carefully collect the locuſts that not one was left behind? What natural cauſe can be aſſigned for the death of all the firſt born in Egypt? A peſtilence makes no diſtinction between the firſt and ſecond, or third. What cauſe inferior to omnipotence can be aſſigned for the waters in the Red Sea dividing and forming themſelves like walls on both ſides of the paſſage, through which the Children of Iſrael paſſed? It is well known that water and all other liquids form themſelves to an horizontal level as far as the curvature of the earth permits. The ſimple narration of the ſacred writer confounds all the different opinions which are offered by Deiſtical critics in order to invalidate, or at leaſt to reduce the force of this miracle. The Iſraelites, ſays one, took advantage of an ebb tide, which was greatly increaſed by a ſtrong wind, which continued all night; yes, but the wind did not blow the water out of the paſſage and form it like walls on both ſides, that inſtead of diminiſhing would have increaſed the prodigy. "The Children of Iſrael," ſays the writer, "paſſed through the middle of the dry ſea, and the water was as a wall both to the right hand and the left." Exodus, 14th Chap. 22 v.

They did not paſs through the ſea, ſays another, they only went a certain diſtance and then turned back to the ſame deſert from which they had entered it. Moſes ſays they paſſed through it; David thought ſo too, Pſ. 104 and 113; and *St. Paul* believed it, and the Jews, to whom he addreſſed his epiſtle, did not

doubt it: "by faith they paſſed through the Red Sea as on dry land." Epiſt. to the Heb. Chap. 11. v. 29.

The abſurdity of theſe opinions is ſuch, that it is matter of ſurpriſe that the authors themſelves, however ignorant they may be ſuppoſed, did not remark it; that they did not obſerve in contradicting the ſimple narration of the ſacred writer they contradicted the principles of common ſenſe: for to give the greateſt poſſible weight to their opinions, let us ſuppoſe that the tide was greater than uſual, that the ebb continued twelve or fourteen hours, or more, if they wiſh to have a miracle to ſupport the abſurdity of their reaſoning; that the waters retired not three or four hundred, but twelve or fourteen hundred yards. Did the ebb continue long enough, and was the ſpace ſufficient to give a paſſage out of the reach of Pharaoh and his army, to a body of ſix hundred and three thouſand five hundred and fifty men, upwards of twenty years old, to all the women, children and old men, to all their flocks and their herds, and their baggage? "We will depart, ſaid Moſes, with our little ones and our old people, with our ſons, and our daughters, with our ſheep and our herds." Exodus, 10 Chap 9 v. And Pharaoh ſaid, diſmiſſing them: "take your ſheep, and your herds, as you deſired." 12 Chap. 32 v. Was Pharaoh and his people ſo ignorant as not to know that if the Children of Iſrael followed the tide, they muſt return to the ſame ſhore again? Was it not more ſimple to wait their return than to purſue them? If he had not ſeen an immenſe paſſage open and clear of incumbrances would he have entered it with his chariots? To give ſome colour of probability, or rather of poſſibility, to theſe opinions, let it be ſuppoſed, that the paſſage was effected near the northern extremity of the Red Sea,

or,

or, as it is now called, the Iſthmus of Suez; even in that extravagant ſuppoſition, both time and ſpace would have been deficient, and Pharaoh moſt certainly would not have loſt himſelf and his army in the purſuit: he might have paſſed on the Iſthmus, and found them on the other ſide. Every ſuppoſition made in defence of theſe opinions, only ſerves to ſhew their abſurdity, the ignorance and obſtinacy of their authors. To pretend that Moſes was an impoſtor; that he prevailed on his people to believe that they had paſſed through the Red Sea, though no ſuch thing had happened, is ſuch an extravagant aſſertion that it deſerves contempt not a ſerious refutation.

It is ſaid that the Children of Iſrael "departing from Phthahiroth, paſſed through the middle of the Sea into the wilderneſs, and, walking three days through the wilderneſs of Etham, they pitched their camp in Mara." Numbers 33 Chap. 8 v. And in the 6th verſe of the ſame Chapter, as alſo Exodus 13 Chap. 20 v, it is ſaid, "that they paſſed from Socoth and pitched their camp in *Etham*, in the extremity of the wilderneſs:" hence it is inferred that they only went a certain diſtance into the Sea and returned to the ſame deſert again. To this the writer replies that *Etham*, where they pitched their camp, ſignifies a particular place in the extremity of the wilderneſs, not the wilderneſs itſelf, if it be not thought that the whole be compriſed within a part, an abſurdity too groſs even for the credulity of a Deiſt. On the oppoſite ſide, the whole of the wilderneſs is called *Etham*, not a particular ſpot of it. Add to this, that Moſes ſays, in that very text, that they paſſed through the middle of the Sea, "*Bethok ha jam ha midbarah*, into the wilderneſs, in the moſt expreſſive manner.

To give ſome colour of truth to this opinion it is ſaid that the dead bodies of the Egyptians, which were

ſeen

ſeen by the Children of Iſrael on the ſhore, muſt have been brought back by the flood tide. The appearance of the dead bodies only ſerves to confirm Moſes's relation; for as the Egyptians purſued the Children of Iſrael ſo cloſely that they would have overtaken them, but for the interpoſition of the cloud, which prevented the junction, the van of the Egyptian army muſt have been cloſe to the rear of the Iſraelites, during the whole paſſage, and conſequently near the ſhore, on which they landed at the time of its deſtruction. This accounts for Pharaoh's raſhneſs in the purſuit: the paſſage muſt have been immenſely large and clear, perhaps the waters at ſuch a diſtance, on each ſide, that he did not attend to them in the eagerneſs of the purſuit, or if he did, he muſt have concluded that a junction of the waters muſt involve the Iſraelites with his army in one common ruin: "it ſtood (the cloud) between the camps of the Egyptians and the camps of Iſrael ..... ſo that the whole night they could not approach each other."

If Moſes's deſcription of this event be minutely diſcuſſed, it will appear extremely probable, that Pharaoh and his Egyptians did not know that they had entered on the bed of the ſea: they arrived at Phahiroth which is the point at which the Iſraelites croſſed the ſea, there the cloud reſted between them and the fugitives, the cloud was dark on the Egyptian ſide, whilſt it enlightened the night on the oppoſite ſide, the Egyptians naturally continued the purſuit of an immenſe multitude of people upon dry land without ſuſpecting that they were on the bed of the ſea, the purſuit continued the whole night long, at the morning watch their deſtruction commenced and the junction of the waters compleated it.

However great this prodigy, it was not greater than that which we find in the book of Joſhua, nor more

more violently conteſted by men, who, to free themſelves from the reſtraints of religion, are diſpoſed to ſwallow any abſurdity rather than admit the truth. Joſhua, by God's order, directs the Prieſts, who carried the Ark, to proceed to the brink of the River Jordan, and reſt their feet in the water. Inſtantly the waters above were ſtopped and ſwelled as a mountain, and the waters below deſcended to the ſea of the deſert, or the Dead Sea; and "the people paſſed over againſt Jericho, whilſt the Prieſts, who carried the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord ſtood on dry land in the midſt of Jordan, and the people paſſed on the dry bed of the river." Joſhua Chap. 3, v. 17. Againſt this paſſage over the river Jordan under the conduct of Joſhua no ſuppoſitions are admiſſible. A direct contradiction is full of abſurdity: Joſhua did not, nor could not impoſe on ſuch a numerous body of people; by him the lands were parcelled out amongſt the tribes; forty eight cities ſet apart for the Levites, which diviſion continued to the deſtruction of the Jewiſh nation. The book of Joſhua is the public regiſter of the nation, contains the titles, on which their lands were held, deſcribes their boundaries, never was book more authentic, and in no book of the Scriptures are there more aſtoniſhing prodigies recorded.

The deſtruction of the walls of Jericho by the ſound of a trumpet, Joſ. 6 Chap. 20 v. The ſuſpenſion of the diurnal motion of the Earth and Moon, Joſ. 10 Chap. 13 v. "And the Sun ſtood in the midſt of the Heavens and did not haſten to ſet for the ſpace of one day." 14th. "There was not before nor ſince a day ſo long, God obeying the voice of a man."

This laſt prodigy gave riſe to many ſuppoſitions each inconſiſtent with the other, and all of them inconſiſtent with truth, which is to be found in the

the ſimple narration of the ſacred writer, not elſewhere.

Says one, the Sun and Moon did not ſtop but the ſlaughter was as great as if the day had been lengthened.

God, ſays another, had placed ſome lucid body in the clouds to ſupply the Sun's place, or perhaps had increaſed the light of the Moon.

A Parhelion or Parſelene, in plain Engliſh a mock Sun, or a mock Moon, might produce the effect, if we believe ſome pretenders to optics.

The Sun apparently ſtopped, but in reality continued its courſe, ſays a bold commentator, whoſe authority is of no great weight amongſt Chriſtians, however he offers the reaſons, on which his opinion is founded, becauſe, ſays he, in the principles of Aſtronomy, it is not the Sun which revolves about the earth but the earth which turns round the Sun, the Sun could not ſtop over the valley of Gabaon, becauſe that city was not under the ecliptic but declining towards the tropic of Cancer; becauſe it would be more convenient to poſtpone the victory to the enſuing day; becauſe the fact is cited from the *Book of the Juſt*, a poetical and conſequently figurative work, and merely ſignifies that by an extraordinary refraction of the Sun's beams the light continued ſomething longer than uſual above the horizon; becauſe as Joſhua ordered the Moon to ſtand againſt the valley of Ajalon, he muſt have prayed after the Sun was ſet, or whatever lucid body or refraction of light ſupplied its place, finally it would have been extremely inconvenient to the inhabitants of the oppoſite hemiſphere to be deprived of the light of the Sun ſo long, and it is not probable that ſo many people would have been afflicted to enable Joſhua to deſtroy his enemies.

The laſt opinion which deſerves any notice, is that of

of ſome well-meaning, but uninformed Chriſtians, who from the truth of this fact, of which they have no doubt, infer that the Earth is fixed and that the Sun revolves about it.

The firſt opinion is a direct contradiction to the text; it would be more convenient to reject the authority of the Book at once.

The ſecond ſubſtitutes on imaginary miracle to a real prodigy, it deſerves no anſwer. If there be a miracle at all admitted, why reject that, which is recorded to ſubſtitute one that is only ſuppoſed? If it be thought that God of his free will eſtabliſhed the mechanical laws, to which the material world is ſubject, he might at the ſame inſtant have ordered a temporary ſuſpenſion of any one of them with equal facility; and to pretend that mechanical laws are not ſubject to his controul is to make him dependent on his creatures, not his creatures on him. This ſurpaſſes abſurdity.

The third only argues the ignorance of its author. A parhelion or parſelene is but a certain portion of that luminous circle, which ſometimes ſurrounds, or rather appears to ſurround, the Sun or Moon, from which ſome refracted rays repreſent the Sun or Moon in that point from which they come direct to the eye, a parhelion therefore or parſelene could not remain over the horizon when the Sun and Moon was far under it without ſubſtituting one prodigy to another.

The fourth alſo gives an imaginary miracle to exclude a real one: for an appearance of the Sun above the horizon for many hours after Sun ſet is evidently miraculous: and all the reaſons, which he offers in ſupport of his opinion, prove nothing: whether the Sun revolves round the Earth or the Earth turns round the Sun, is uſeleſs to enquire, a man muſt always ſpeak the language which is underſtood: Aſtronomers

now

now a-days believe that the Earth deſcribes its orbit round the Sun as the centre of its motion, and they believe it on ſufficient grounds; they alſo know that the Earth, in its diurnal motion, turns round its own axis, expoſing an entire hemiſphere to that blaze of light, which the Sun emits continually, enjoys all the bleſſings of light on that hemiſphere, whilſt the oppoſite is involved in darkneſs; they know that the Sun neither ſets nor riſes, but is ſaid to riſe when any point on the ſurface of the Earth comes to the light, and is ſaid to ſet, when that point deſcribes a ſemi-circle and is again immerſed in darkneſs, yet all Aſtronomers ſay that the Sun riſes and ſets, that its daily motion is from the eaſt to the weſt. Thus in fact is its apparent motion, being in an oppoſite ſenſe to the real motion of the earth, which is from the weſt to the eaſt. But this is the language which mankind underſtands, and if a man were to ſpeak a different language he would not be underſtood.

The ſecond reaſon given is frivolous. Though the Sun was not vertical to the Valley of Gabaon, it might have been in, or near, the circle, which was verticle to it, and that authoriſed Joſhua to ſay it was over it, over and under are relative terms. The next reaſon is paſſed unnoticed, the author ſeems diſpoſed to give advice to his Creator. As to the enſuing reaſon, it is true, the ſacred writer ſays the prodigy is written in the *Book of the Juſt*, but he does not refer us to that book for the truth of his aſſertion. Whether that book was poetical or not, which is mere matter of ſurmiſe, there is no figurative expreſſion in the book of Joſhua, where this fact is recorded. That Joſhua did not pray until after Sun Set becauſe he ordered the Moon to ſtand over the Valley of Ajalon is a ſtrange aſſertion. What has the author never ſeen the Sun and Moon above the hori-

zon

zon at the ſame time? If Joſhua had ordered the Moon to ſtand over the Valley of Gabaon with the Sun the obſervation would have been judicious, but that the Sun ſhould be in the verticle over or near the Valley of Gabaon, and the Moon near the verticle of Ajalon is matter of ſurpriſe but to a man, who is unacquainted with their motions.

In his laſt obſervation he introduces a new ſort of evidence, that is, the probability of inconvenience to one nation is ſufficient to prove that a fact, which is publicly known, and authentically recorded by another nation has not happened. As to the inconvenience, to which the inhabitants of the other hemiſphere were expoſed, it was poſſible there might be ſome, but it was not injurious: if a man be deprived of that to which he has a ſtrict right, the inconvenience he ſuffers is injurious and unjuſt; but if a man be deprived of that, which he holds from the mere bounty of another, however great the inconvenience, there is no injury, no injuſtice. The inconvenience complained of was not great, nor was there any derangement in the order of the Heavenly Bodies: a ſuſpenſion of the diurnal motion of the Earth, whilſt the annual motion continued the ſame, was all that was neceſſary to effect that ſtupendous prodigy. The motion of rotation about the axis of the Earth, which produces day and night, is unconnected with its influence on the other celeſtial bodies: it can at leaſt neither increaſe nor diminiſh it.

From theſe words of Joſhua, and ſimilar expreſſions, in other parts of the Scripture, to infer that the Earth is immoveable, and that the Sun effects a revolution round it in twenty-four hours, is injudicious. Theſe expreſſions ſignify no more than the apparent motion of the Sun, and the apparent immobility of the Earth, it is the language of ſcience and of ignorance,

it is the language of all mankind, the ſacred penmen muſt have ſpoken it, if they wiſhed to be underſtood. We ſay now, as Solomon did, that the Sun riſes and ſets, that it comes to the meridian, &c. Eccl. 1ſt Chap. 5 v. In the preceding verſe it is ſaid, that the Earth ſtands for ever. This has no reference to the immobility of the Earth: it ſimply ſignifies that the Earth continues to exiſt, or ſubſiſts. *Hamadeth.* Though generations ſucceed each other.

The Pentateuch of all works the moſt ſimple, the moſt ſublime, the moſt ſatisfactory, is by our modern Philoſophers ſet in competition with the romantic tales of Sanchoniaton, a Phenician author, who lived, if at all, about two thouſand years before the Chriſtian æra, of which ſome fragments remain, thought to be ſuppoſed by Dodwell and Dupin, with the rhapſody of Zoroaſter, a Perſian tale writer, whom Iluet demonſtrates to have been a fabulous perſonage; with an Indian work called *Hanſcrit* or *Sanſcrit*, of which they pretend to underſtand a few words; they might have added *Ovid's Metamorphoſes*, if the work were not in the hands of children, and they are deſirous of paſſing for men of profound learning; of ſome of theſe pretended works they give what, they call verſions, the ravings of their own fancy, and cite manuſcripts which do not exiſt but in their own imagination. From all this they conclude the immenſe antiquity given to the world by Egyptian and Chineſe tales, to be well authenticated, and thence infer that Moſes's account of the Creation is fabulous. A man of real ſcience, would draw a contradictory inference, for having as we have already ſeen, the moſt inconteſtible evidence of the authenticity of the Pentateuch, he would conclude, without heſitation, that all accounts inconſiſtent with it were fabulous. Our modern critics are extraordinary men; in the moſt abſurd

ſurd fables they ſee nothing but truth, and in ſimple truth they diſcover impoſſibilities; the vanity of the men is a glaſs, which diſtorts every object.

In the Book of Geneſis, ſay they, there are many things which appear fabulous, the creation of the world in ſix days, which might have been done in an inſtant, the ſeduction of Eve by a ſerpent ſpeaking her language, the folly of Adam, the founder of the world, to think that by eating a fruit he ſhould become equal to God.

A man of ſenſe judges of facts by the authenticity of the book which relates them, he does not judge of the authenticity of the book, by the facts which it records; if we were to reject all the facts, of which we do not clearly conceive the reaſons, nine tenths of all hiſtories ſhould be at once ſuppreſſed.

Nothing obliged the Almighty God to create all the Beings which compoſe the Univerſe at the ſame inſtant; he yet continues to create, and will continue until the end of time, he thereby ſhews his independence on his creatures, and their total dependence on him. To enquire why he gives exiſtence to ſuch a man, at ſuch a point of time preciſely, and not either before, or after, is impertinent: he is not obliged to give the man an exiſtence at any time: it is a matter of grace, not of right, when granted; this reaſoning is applicable to every Being, which contributes to compoſe the Univerſe.

That a woman's vanity may expoſe her to temptation is not matter of ſurpriſe; and that the organs of the ſerpent ſet in motion by ſo powerful an agent as the Demon, ſhould form articulate ſounds is not difficult to conceive. Adam did not think that eating the fruit would make him equal to God, he well knew the contrary. "Adam was not ſeduced." Epiſt. to Titus, 2. Chap. Nor did Eve expect an

equality

equality but a similarity of knowledge: she was miserably deceived, as are her children, our modern Deists, whose vanity and curiosity resembles that of their mother.

Why did not Moses begin his recital with the ruin of the Angels? He did not write their history. The Jews in his time knew it; it was not necessary to inform them, he expressly forbid them to consult Evil Spirits, Deut. 18 Chap. 11 v. "There will not be amongst you a man to consult *Ob*," that is a Spirit speaking as through the navel, a Ventriloque.

The existence of these Evil Spirits was known to the Heathen world as to the Christian; the nature of the crime inductive of their perdition is known but by mere conjecture, the text of Isaias, which is applied by some to the chief of these rebel spirits, literally regards the King of Tyr. The whole text is strongly metaphorical. "I will ascend into Heaven, I will exalt my throne above the highest stars, I will sit in the mountain of the testament, in the sides of the north." Isaias, 14th Chap. 13 v. If this Evil Spirit, proud of his own excellence, pretended a sort of equality with, or rather independence on, his God, it is not more surprising than to hear the Atheist dispute even the existence of his God. It is for this reason that Job calls him "King over all the sons of pride." Job, 41 Chap. 25 v.

The pretended antiquity of the Chinese monarchy is offered by our modern Deists as totally subversive of Moses's account of the Creation, they may add the Babylonian annals, which give four hundred thousand years to their empire, and the Egyptian, which equal them in absurdity. The account given by Moses has every possible mark of authenticity, the Chinese, Babylonian and Egyptian annals are puerile fables. Mr. Goguet says, in his origin of laws, "that the astro-

nomical

nomical obſervations, with which ſome have endeavoured to ſupport the pretended antiquity of the Chineſe are manifeſtly ſuppoſed, that ſome of their literati, though the Chineſe in general have no idea of criticiſm, remarked it; that it may be ſaid with confidence that there is no credit whatſoever to be given to their hiſtory, previous to the year 206, before the Chriſtian æra; that until that time it is a tiſſue of fables and contradictions, a monſtrous chaos, out of which nothing, that is reaſonable, or connected can be extracted." Such is the work, which in the idea of the Deiſt is ſufficient to condemn the plain ſimple narrative of Moſes.

"The Chineſe hiſtorians," ſay the authors of the Univerſal Hiſtory, "have applied in a ridiculous manner to the ancient ſtate of their monarchy the confuſed notions tranſmitted to them by vague tradition concerning the creation of the world, the formation of man, the deluge, the inſtitutions of arts, of all this they compoſed a monſtrous ſyſtem of hiſtory."

The reader may reſt ſatisfied with the following ſpecimen of the boaſted hiſtory of the Chineſe:

Toby was conceived by his mother in contact with a rainbow, his body was partly that of a ſerpent, and Chin-nung had the head of an ox. If the reader deſires to know more of this remarkable hiſtory he muſt conſult ſome modern Scioliſt who is accuſtomed to ſwallow monſtrous abſurdities, the writer is not diſpoſed to laviſh time on nonſenſe.

The Chineſe calculation of eclipſes during the ſpace of four thouſand years is merely imaginary; about a century and a half ago they were obliged to have recourſe to the Mahometans for the calculation of their almanacks; and in 1772, they were forced to call for ſome Jeſuits to fill the tribunal of mathematics,

tics, which by the death of Father Hallerſtein could no longer continue its calculations. Mathematical calculation is too abſtruſe for a Chineſe: before the introduction of Europeans their knowledge of that ſcience was low indeed, nor is it yet much increaſed. Father Martin read, in one of their moſt authentic books, that in the reign of Yahoe or Yao the Sun enlightened China during the ſpace of ten days and ten nights. The calculation of the eclipſes reported in their annals is ſo incorrect, that Caſſini by correcting their errors retrenched ſix hundred years from their chronology. After all from the calculation of eclipſes no inference can be drawn in favour of the antiquity of any country: ſuch calculations may extend as far as man's imagination can reach, either backward or forward. Mr. Touquet, the titular biſhop of Eleuthropolis, publiſhed in 1729, a chronological table, which a Tartarian nobleman had extracted from the changcun, or great annals of the empire. In this table the commencement of true chronology amongſt the Chineſe, is fixed in the reign of Lye-vang, three hundred and forty-four years before the Chriſtian Æra: more acute chronologiſts fix it at a much later period. It is needleſs to obſerve that Xi-hvam-tu, a ſanguinary and vigilant tyrant, deſtroyed all the annals of China in his reign, which continued thirty ſeven years. So attentive was he on the deſtruction of theſe annals, that he burned four hundred and ſixty of their literati, together with the annals which they had concealed, he thus ſuppreſſed a work filled with ridiculous fables, and on uncertain confuſed tradition a ſort of rhapſody was ſubſtituted equally if not more fabulous than the former.

The Chineſe Emperors exerciſe their dominion over time as well as place: they grant letters of nobility,

lity, which have a retro-active force, enobling the grantee's anceſtors for two, for four, or perhaps ten thouſand years before. The antiquity of ſuch an empire muſt be great in their imagination, to contradict their pretended antiquity is a capital offence. Du Halde's deſcription of China, T. 1. Hence the Miſſionaries dare not ſay what they think, and to give their opinions in writing would be highly indiſcreet.

Diodorus, of Sicily, in the firſt book of his Bibliotheca, ſect. 2, ſays: "Gods, as ſome of the Egyptian writers relate, reigned firſt in Egypt, then Heroes (that is Demi-Gods) about eighteen thouſand years, the laſt of theſe was Hirus the ſon of Iſis, the kingdom was governed by men about fifteen thouſand years. This requires no comment, theſe Gods and Heroes are imaginary Beings."

The Babylonian and Egyptian tales, are paſſed unnoticed, they reſemble the Arabian Nights' Entertainments.

The writer comes now to diſcuſs another difficulty ſtated againſt Moſes's account of the Creation. Strong marks, indications of the moſt remote antiquity, are to be found in the phyſical world, which are manifeſtly inconſiſtent with the antiquity aſcribed by Moſes to the Creation: A famous naturaliſt gravely tells us, that the Sea has ſucceſſively covered all the different parts of this globe, that the higheſt mountains were for many ages under the Sea. The latter part of this aſſertion contradicts the former, the ſpirit of infidelity ſo blinds men, even of ſome ſcience, that they dont remark the glaring inconſiſtencies, which they frequently advance in a few words. Since, according to the known laws of hydroſtatics, water, and all other liquids, compoſe themſelves to a level ſo that every point of the ſurface is equi-diſtant from the attracting centre, if the higheſt mountains on earth were

were covered with water, the whole earth was covered not ſucceſſively but at the ſame time, and the waters were raiſed above the preſent ſurface of the Sea to the height of the higheſt mountains, the naturaliſt forgot to tell us how this immenſe quantity of water was diſpoſed of, nor has he deigned to inform us how the human ſpecies, or land animals, which are not accuſtomed, at leaſt in our times, to live in water, managed to ſubſiſt during them ages. It is true one of his admirers tells us that men were at that time fiſh, and that when the waters retiring they were left on dry land, their tails opened and became legs: we muſt thank this gentleman for the information he gives, whether we acknowledge a fiſh or a monkey for an anceſtor is of little conſequence. Theſe are the teachers of the world! Theſe are the men, whom nature has been endeavouring to form for millions of years, they now come at length to undeceive the world!

The Naturaliſt adds an obſervation, by way of proof, that the re-entering angles on one ſide of the mountains, are oppoſite to the ſalient angles on the other. This like the former is an effect of his imagination: in ſome places they are, in others they are not. There are many mountains inſulated immenſely diſtant from any other. Mountains and valleys formed as they are argue the wiſdom and bounty of the Creator: mountains break the current of air—make the winds variable, which would without them, blow always in the ſame direction. In them are placed receptacles for waters, which the clouds convey to their ſummit, and when condenſed, ſo that they become ſpecifically heavier than air, fall in drops of rain, this rain collected into theſe receptacles, iſſue from the ſides of the mountains through ſprings, which uniting in the valleys form rivulets, and there uniting form rivers, as the valleys are intended for conveying the

the waters, their ſinuoſities are neceſſary to prevent the too great rapidity of the waters, which deſcending from the mountains with an accelerated velocity, if not broken in their courſe would ravage the country. Mountains were previous to the Deluge, they were then neceſſary as they are now. Perhaps the Flood may have formed ſome, or broken others, but in general from their neceſſity they muſt have entered into the plan of the Creation.

The Naturaliſt pretends that the ſea has formed the mountains, though the Flood in his opinion could not, the Flood if we believe him had made no change in the ſurface of the earth. The aſſertion is rather bold: what, the ſea riſing fifteen cubits above the higheſt mountains, in the greateſt poſſible agitation, made no change! St. Peter thought there was a total change. "The then World flooded with water periſhed the Heavens and Earth which now are." .... Epiſt. 2, Chap. 3, v. 6 and 7.

If, ſays the Naturaliſt, the ſurface of the earth had been diſſolved by the Flood, the different ſubſtances, which compoſe it, ought to have been depoſed by the waters when ſettled, deſcending according to their ſpecific gravity, yet we ſee rocks of granite placed over ſand and mud, and light ſubſtances deep in the earth, whilſt the moſt weighty are found on the very ſurface. If this had been univerſally the caſe this difficulty would appear ſerious, but the contrary is true in general, the more heavy ſubſtances are found at the greateſt depth. In ſo great a commotion a mathematical exactneſs was not obſerved, moreover theſe rocks, which are now found at the ſurface of the earth, immediately over lighter ſubſtances, were they rocks at that time? An immenſe rock never did ſwim in water. If theſe have been depoſed they muſt have been then of a lighter nature, ſand or ſlime,

which in the courſe of time has been coagulated by the intervention of ſome fluid, or ſome other natural agent. Petrifactions are not uncommon.

Banks of ſhells, which are frequently found far diſtant from the ſea, evince the truth of the Flood; theſe ſhells are formed of a certain ſubſtance, which is not ſubject to decay, from the immenſe quantities found in ſome places the Naturaliſt infers that the ſea muſt have reſted longer than is conſiſtent with Moſes's account of the Flood. Here he offers mere conjecture as evidence againſt a well-known fact. Is it not poſſible that the waters of the Deluge might have been reſtrained in theſe valleys by ſome obſtacle which time had removed? Incalculable quantities of ſhells are collected in a ſhort time, and, what concludes evidently againſt the Naturaliſt, bones of animals have been found in countries where they do not breed, where they cannot live, the bones of elephants in Siberia, and in 1772 the bones of a rhinoceros were found there. It is well known that the elephant and rhinoceros are inhabitants of hot countries, that their bones muſt have been tranſported to Siberia by ſome ſuch inundation as the flood; the waters which depoſed their bones in Siberia muſt have taken them up in Africa or Aſia, far ſouth of Siberia. Theſe animals are not inhabitants of the ſea as the ſhell-fiſh of Touraine.

An Engliſh traveller, intending to extend the ſphere of human knowledge, by his own experiments, found by examining the different layers emitted in the eruptions of Mount Ætna, that the world is at leaſt fourteen thouſand years old. There are, he ſays, to be ſeen in ſome places ſeven layers, or beds, one over the other, each covered with an excellent bed of ſoil, two thouſand years are not more than ſufficient to convert one of theſe layers into a good mould. Hence this

this mathematician infers there muſt have paſſed fourteen thouſand years to convert theſe ſeven layers into earth. But if theſe layers are converted into mould, how did he find the ſeven yet entire, and a bed of earth between each layer and the next to it? It ſeems fourteen thouſand years have not yet converted the firſt of the ſeven into mould, as this wonderful calculator found it entire, thus, inſtead of enlarging the ſcience of mankind, he adds his mite to that immenſe ſtock of ignorance, and vanity, which we find in the writings of our modern travellers. Let us, however, ſuppoſe that this our traveller intended to ſay, that each bed of volcanic matter required two thouſand years to cover it with vegetative earth, his obſervation would then coincide with the conjectures made by more intelligent men on the eruptions of Mount Veſuvius, the layers of volcanic matter ſay they, are found in ſome places to the number of ſix, with a bed of vegetative earth between the layers of volcanic matter, hence they infer that ages without number muſt have elapſed before this accumulation could have been formed. One of theſe travellers however relates a fact which totally deſtroys theſe conjectures. The city of Herculaneum, buried by an earthquake, is in ſome parts ſeventy feet, in others one hundred and twelve feet under the preſent ſurface of the earth. Between the ſurface of the earth and the city, or rather the ruins of this city, are ſeveral layers of volcanic matter, and between theſe layers are beds of vegatative earth. Our Engliſh traveller would have found many thouſands of years in this phœnomenon, yet we know that eighteen hundred years have not yet paſſed ſince Herculaneum was a flouriſhing city.

The vegetative earth is placed in a ſhort time over the volcanic matter by many uniting cauſes: aſhes,

earth,

earth, duſt and other ſubſtances, are emitted by the volcano, the rains waſh down earth from the ſides of the mountains, men and animals bring ſubſtances which are ſoon converted into earth, the induſtrious huſbandman covers the moſt barren rock with vegetative mould. Thus ſimple facts confound the wild conjectures of wondering, and wonder-telling travellers.

But there are many extinguiſhed volcanos found of which no writer ſpeaks, theſe at leaſt ſpeak the remote antiquity of the world.

True, there are many found, and many more may be found if ſought for in the wilds of America, of Africa and Aſia, where no writer is to be found; phœnomenons ſometimes paſs unnoticed even by good writers, and of the writings of many, who might have noticed them, ſome have fallen victims to the ravages of time.

There is no ancient fact more authentic than the Deluge: Moſes deſcribes it 856 years after it happened when the fact was freſh in the memory of man; when it was impoſſible for him to impoſe on the world; the Son of Sirach ſpeaks of it as an undoubted fact, Eccl. 44th Chap. 18th and 19th v. St. Paul, in his Epiſtle to the Hebrews, Chap. 11. v. 7, aſcribes Noah's preſervation to his faith. The Saviour himſelf, Matthew 24 Chap. 38 and 39 v. compares his laſt coming to the time of Noah, when the flood deſtroyed mankind. The ſame is repeated in St. Luke, 17 Chap. 26 v. St. Peter, in his 1ſt Epiſt. 3 Chap. 20th v, ſays there were but eight ſouls ſaved in the Ark; and in his ſecond Epiſt. Chap. 2, v. 5, he ſays that God did not ſpare the primitive world, that he ſaved Noah, eighth, the preacher of juſtice, and brought the Flood on the impious.

On this ſubject the Heathen writers agree with the ſacred penmen: Beroſus the Chaldean tells us that the

the Ark, near the end of the Deluge, ſtopped on a mountain of Armenia; this teſtimony is not offered as authentic, though cited by ſome writers. Beroſus was cotemporary with Alexander the Great, Prieſt of the Temple of Belas, in Chaldea. Some fragments of his hiſtory remain in Joſephus, the work itſelf is loſt, and no loſs to the world. The romance publiſhed in his name under the title of Antiquities, is a ſuppoſed piece. See Hiſt. des G. Hom. Nicolas, of Damaſcus, in the 96th book of his hiſtory, ſays that one man eſcaped in a veſſel from the univerſal flood, and that the remains of the veſſel were preſerved a long time on a high mountain in Armenia; Abydenus, in his hiſtory of the ancient Medes and Aſſyrians, deſcribes the Flood nearly as Moſes did; Ovid, in his Metamorphoſes, attempts a deſcription of the Flood, which he intermixes with ridiculous fables, as he did every other event, which he deſcribes, and Varro ſpeaks of the time which elapſed from Adam's creation to the Flood, "from the commencement of mankind to the Flood; finally the Chineſe ſay that a man whom they call Puencuus eſcaped with his family from the univerſal deluge. This agreement of ſacred and profane writers, atteſting the tradition of the world, is ſurely more than ſufficient to authenticate a fact, in which the whole world was intereſted. It is not wild ſuppoſitions, and impertinent queſtions which invalidate public facts.

From the dimenſions of the Ark, as deſcribed by Moſes, it is not difficult to demonſtrate that there was in it a ſufficient ſpace to contain the animals preſerved from the Flood, together with the neceſſary proviſions for the time they were encloſed.

It is alſo certain that there is a ſufficient quantity of water to cover the higheſt mountains on the earth without any increaſe, which if neceſſary was eaſy to

omnipotence.

omnipotence. It is well known to the judicious philoſopher that there is an incalculable quantity of water ſuſpended in the atmoſphere, we ſee with what rapidity a high wind dries up ſmall pools of water, becauſe every layer of air, which comes in contact with the water, inſtantly abſorbs a quantity of water, neceſſary to ſaturate that layer, and theſe layers ſucceed each other in proportion to the velocity of the wind: a quantity therefore neceſſary to ſaturate the whole atmoſphere may remain ſuſpended, if an extra quantity be raiſed it muſt again deſcend in rain, or, if condenſed by cold, in ſnow or hail. Diſſertations have been written by other men on this ſubject, and the moſt ſatisfactory ſolutions given to all the difficulties, which wild ſpeculatiſts propoſe.

As to the exiſtence of whole nations of giants and pygmies, they exiſt in the imagination of Atheiſts: ſome have been, and ſome few are, of an extraordinary ſize, and ſome others extremely little; but theſe do not form nations, nor are they of a different ſpecies, their anceſtors are known. The term Gibor which has been tranſlated by that of Giant ſignifies a powerful and violent man. They are numerous now as they were before the Flood; and now as then we call virtuous, pious men, the ſons of light, the children of God; and vain, capricious, diſſolute girls, may well be called the daughters of men, marriage contracts between ſuch characters, were cenſured by Moſes, and the conſequences marked in the ſimilarity of manners between the children and their mothers. This we ſee every day. The children of God marrying the daughters of men gave riſe to many ridiculous tales and wild conjectures. Ignorance finds myſteries where common ſenſe can diſcern none.

Difficulties are ſtated by ſome pretenders to ſcience againſt

againſt Moſes's account from the different colours of the human ſpecies in different countries. Theſe are as frivolous as the former. Difference in colour as in height, in ſtrength, in activity, in underſtanding, is merely accidental, the human ſpecies, is, in all individuals eſſentially the ſame. The black man in Ethiopia, the copper-coloured ſavage in Canada, the white man in Europe, is the ſame man, tinged with the colour of the climate, in which he lives, his food and manner of living contribute to increaſe or diminiſh the effect of the climate. Some anatomiſts imagine that the pores in the ſcarf ſkin of the black, dilated by the burning heat of a vertical ſun, abſorb a greater quantity of light; others think that the effect is produced by the great poroſity of the inner ſkin; and ſome think that there is a liquid ſubſtance between the ſcarf ſkin and the inner ſkin, which abſorbs the light. It is manifeſt, without conſulting optics, that any body which abſorbs the light muſt appear black. A diſſertation on this ſubject may be curious, but is totally uſeleſs: reaſon ſays that a black man and a white man, a big man and a little man, a lame man and a blind man, a fool and a knave, are men, individuals of the ſame ſpecies, differenced individually not ſpecifically. A man and a horſe are individuals of different ſpecies, differenced ſpecifically, not individually. This may ſerve as a general anſwer to all the difficulties, which are founded on the difference of ſize, of colour, of wit, of ſtrength, &c. of men in the ſame or in different climates.

We have now examined the moſt material difficulties ſtated by Atheiſts and Deiſts againſt Moſes's account of the Creation, and ſhewn them to be frivolous in the extreme. That remote antiquity which they aſcribe to the world, and all the marks of this antiquity are merely imaginary, the offspring of ignorance

ignorance and vanity: the diſcerning philoſopher diſcovers the moſt ſenſible indications of the contrary: the late invention of many arts and ſciences, the increaſing population, yet leaving one half the world a wild and uncultivated deſert, are ſtubborn truths which forced that infamouſly famous Atheiſt *Lucretius*, to acknowledge that the preſent world was not of remote antiquity. He thought that other Poets would have ſung wars previous to that of Thebes or Troy, at leaſt that ſome monuments of that remote antiquity would be found. It has alſo been ſhewn that Moſes did atteſt his legation by miraculous powers; that the prodigies recorded in his Books could not be ſuppoſed; that the great number of authentic copies given by his order to all Elders and Levites, who were the miniſters of the eſtabliſhed worſhip, with expreſs directions to have them read before all the people, at the great feſtival of the Tabernacles, precluded even a poſſibility of interpolation. It is therefore certain that the truths contained in theſe books are divinely revealed, or elſe that God by an act of his almighty power has atteſted a falſehood, a blaſphemy ſo impious, ſo daring, that even the Deiſt, impious as he is, dare not aſſert it.

We ſhall now proceed to ſtate a ſecond proof, as yet more forcible, of the authenticity of the Scriptures, that is, the prophecies contained in them, which were neither ſuppoſed nor inſerted after the accompliſhment, and of the accompliſhment of which there is the moſt incontrovertible evidence.

We have already remarked that contingent events depending on the concurrence of innumerable cauſes poſſeſſing a power of ſelf-determination, are not within the reach of limited intelligence; to foreſee and foretell ſuch events with the utmoſt certainty is the excluſive prerogative of the Divinity. Conjectural powers

powers increaſe in proportion to the ſagacity of the intelligence; but all conjectures in reſpect to contingent events are uncertain. There is but God only, whoſe ſagacity is infinite, and who of courſe pronounces with unerring certainty. That there are many ſuch events foreſeen, and foretold, and of the accomplishment of which there can be no doubt, is manifeſt to every man, who reads the Scriptures.

Thus that Noah foreſaw the Deluge is evident from his building the Ark and preparing for it; that the patriarch Jacob foreſaw that Ephraim the younger ſon of Joſeph would give his name to one of the Tribes, and to a more numerous Tribe than his elder brother Manaſſes, is equally certain from his announcing it when they were children, of this event the whole Jewiſh nation are witneſſes; that Joſeph foreſaw that ſeven years of famine would ſucceed ſeven years of abundance is incontrovertible, from his being taken out of a priſon in a ſtrange country—placed at the head of the State, and preparing for the famine in the abundant years, of this the Egyptians had, to the deſtruction of their empire, the moſt unequivocal proof; that is, a tax of one fifth of the produce impoſed on all the lands, excluding all the lands appropriated to their Prieſts, who were fed from the King's granaries during the famine, and did not ſell their lands to the Crown, as the other landholders did; he alſo foreſaw that God would withdraw the deſcendants of his father from Egypt, and conduct them into the land which he had promiſed to their anceſtors, or he would not have adjured them to take his bones with them.

Moſes foreſaw and foretold the many calamities of Egypt; the deſtruction of Pharaoh and his army: theſe were facts of the moſt public nature, to which both nations were witneſſes; he foretold, Deut.

17th, that the Children of Iſrael would get poſſeſſion of the land of Canaan, and in the courſe of time elect a King. Of this event there is no doubt; he foretold that they and their King would be carried into captivity, in conſequence of their diſobedience to the laws which he eſtabliſhed. This alſo happened.

Joſhua foretold that, the man, who would re-build Jericho, would be accurſed, that he would loſe his firſt born in laying the foundation and his youngeſt ſon in erecting the gates. Jos. 4th Chap. This event took place many ages after, when Hielo of Bethel re-built that city he loſt Abiram his firſt born in laying the foundation, and Segub his youngeſt in placing the gates, " according to the word of God, by his ſervant Joſhua," ſaid the writer 3d Book of Kings, 16th Chap.

The writer paſſes unnoticed many other events which were foretold, and cites no fact but ſuch as were of ſuch public notoriety that not even the ſhadow of a doubt can fall on them, nor any thing, which has the appearance of a difficulty, be ſtated againſt them. In like manner in the Books of the Prophets are events foretold, againſt the accompliſhment of which no objection can lie: Iſaias, Chap. 5th, foretells the deſtruction of the Jews, and enumerates the crimes, which cauſed the calamity; Chap. 7th he foretold that the Kings of Syria and Iſrael would not take Jeruſalem, and added that in ſixty five years Ephraim would ceaſe to be a people, which prophecy was fulfilled by Sennacherib ſending a new colony to Samaria, 4th B. of Kings, 17th Chap. 24th v.

The deſtruction of Babylon by the Medes he foretold, and its devaſtation for ever, Chap. 13th, the ruin of Moab, Chap. 15th, the devaſtation of Tyre during the ſpace of ſeventy years and its re-eſtabliſhment after, Chap. 22d.

He

He told the King of Juda, Ezechias, that God had added fifteen years to his life, Chap. 38th, and he added, Chap. 39th, that all the treaſures which he had ſhewn through vanity to the Babylonian ambaſſadors, would be carried into Babylon, and that ſome of his children would be eunuchs in the palace of the King of Babylon, though at that time Ezechias had no child, this was not the language of a flattering courtier. He foretold the ſucceſs of Cyrus in his wars two hundred years before his birth, and named him, he alſo added that Cyrus would re-build the city and the temple, which were then in a flouriſhing ſtate, Chap. 44th and 45th. The writer paſſes in ſilence all theſe prophecies againſt which the imagination of the Deiſt may offer the ſhadow of an argument and ſimply adduces theſe, of the event of which there can be no poſſible doubt.

Jeremias foretold many calamities which happened according to his word, and for which he ſuffered ſeverely. The writer gives an inſtance, but one the moſt remarkable, Chap. 25th. He foretold that the inhabitants of Juda would be tranſported into Babylon, and ſerve the Babylonians during the ſpace of ſeventy years, that at the expiration of theſe ſeventy years God would judge Babylon and that it would be deſtroyed for ever. "Behold (ſaith the Lord) I will ſend and aſſume the kindred of the north and Nebuchodonoſor my ſervant on this land and on its inhabitants, ... and theſe nations ſhall ſerve the King of Babylon ſeventy years, and when theſe ſeventy years are expired I will viſit on the King of Babylon, and on that nation, their iniquity, and on the land of the Chaldeans, and I will make them an everlaſting ſolitude." Of the accompliſhment of this prophecy there can be no doubt, the writer of the 4th Book of Kings gives a particular deſcription of the event

event, 25th Chap. and the author of Chronicles concludes thus, v. 17th, " he brought on them the King of the Chaldeans . . . . . and he transferred the treasures of the temple, of the King, and of the Princes, into Babylon, the enemy burned the Houſe of God and deſtroyed the wall of Jeruſalem . . . . if any man eſcaped the ſword, he was carried into Babylon, and ſerved the King and his ſons until the King of Perſia reigned . . . . . until the ſeventy years were fulfilled in the firſt year of Cyrus, King of Perſia . . . . he ordered to be proclaimed in his whole kingdom, even by writing, thus ſaith Cyrus, King of the Perſians : the Lord God of Heaven gave me all the kingdoms of the earth, and he commanded me to build him a houſe in Jeruſalem." . . . . . fulfilling at the ſame time the prophecies of Iſaias and Jeremias.

What ſhadow of objection can imagination ſuggeſt againſt the prophecies of Daniel ? The events which he foretold were of the utmoſt importance to the whole civilized world. Chap. 2 he tells Nebuchodonoſor the viſion which he had forgotten, and all the events which were ſignified in it. Chap. 4th, he told the King the ſevere ſentence which was paſſed againſt him, and the execution of which ſhortly after followed. Chap. 5th, he explained to Baltaſſar a more dreadful ſentence, which was written in myſterious characters on the wall, announcing the death of that unfortunate prince, and the deſtruction of his empire the ſame night. Zenophon's account of that event agrees perfectly with the Prophet's. " Baltaſſar," ſays the Prophet made a great feaſt for his nobles, a thouſand, and they drank each man according to his age . . . . . they drank wine and praiſed their gods ; gold and ſilver, braſs and iron, wood and ſtone, ... " when," ſaid the hiſtorian, " Cyrus heard that there was a great feſtival in Babylon, and that all the Babylonians

Ionians drank and eat the whole night long, as ſoon as it was dark he opened the channels which were previouſly cut near to the river, and turned the water into the marſh Nictiris. Thus Babylon fell in a drunken fit. The accounts of both writers coincide, Chap. 8th, he relates a viſion and explains it: "The ram . . . . . is the King of the Medes and Perſians, and the goat the King of the Greeks, the great horn between its eyes the firſt King (Alexander) and the four horns which roſe when the firſt was broken four Kings of the ſame nation but not in his ſtrength." Joſephus the hiſtorian ſays that when Alexander ſaw this prophecy in which he himſelf was ſo clearly foretold, and his conqueſt of the Medes and Perſians under the figure of the goat breaking the ram's two horns, and trampling on the body, he ſpared the city of Jeruſalem, which he intended to have deſtroyed. And Chap. 11th, Daniel ſeems to write a hiſtory of ſucceeding Princes, and their wars, which the events have literally verified, his account is ſo minute, and correct, that ſome Heathen Philoſophers preſſed by the primitive Chriſtians on the ſubject, finding it impoſſible to decline the force of Daniel's authority, pretended that the hiſtory had been ſuppoſed by the Chriſtians, and written after the events had happened. However the Jews, who are preſſed by Daniel's authority more forcibly than the Heathens, never accuſed the Chriſtians of any ſuppoſition or interpolation.

The Prophet Ezekiel not only foretold events in the moſt ſimple manner, but his very actions were expreſſive of the events. Chap. 12th, v. 7, "I done," ſays the Prophet, "as God commanded me; I produced my veſſels as a man going into captivity by day, and in the evening, I made an opening in the wall with my hand, and I went forth in the dark, and

and was carried on men's ſhoulders in their ſight." ..... 10th v, "ſay to them, thus ſaith the Lord God of Iſrael, this burden is on the Prince, who is in Jeruſalem, and on the whole Houſe of Iſrael, who is in the midſt of them ..... as I have done, ſo will be done to them; they will remove from their dwellings and go into captivity, and the Prince, who is in the midſt of them, ſhall be carried on ſhoulders, he ſhall go forth in the dark, they ſhall dig through the wall to bring him out, his face ſhall be covered that he may not ſee the ground with his eyes, and I will ſpread my net over him and he ſhall be taken in my net, and I will bring him to Babylon into the land of the Chaldeans, and he ſhall not ſee it, and there he ſhall die." The Prophet is more explicit if poſſible, in the 17th Chap. he there aſſigns the reaſon why the King of Babylon would put out Sedecias's eyes, becauſe he was to break his oath of fidelity. We know from the writer of Chronicles terminating his work that this prophecy was literally fulfilled. In the 29th Chap. is foretold the deſtruction of Egypt during the ſpace of forty years, and after that time its re eſtabliſhment, but never in its former power or ſplendor. Of the truth of this prophecy we ourſelves are witneſſes. In the 35th Chap. he announces the perpetual deſtruction of the Idumœans, which happened accordingly.

A number of prophecies, againſt which no objection can be ſtated, are paſſed in ſilence, they all have the ſame tendency, that is, to authenticate the miſſion of the Prophets, and enforce obedience to the law of God. In theſe Prophets we find men born at different periods during a ſpace of many centuries, and in different countries, differing in their occupations, placed in the different ranges of life from the Prince on the throne to the Shepherd in the field, yet no contradiction

diction in their writings, no inconsistency, a perfect coincidence in all, evidently shewing that the same spirit animated them all. Compare this agreement of the Prophets to the disputes, the dissentions, the contradictions of Philosophers ancient and modern; silence, prejudice, passion and party spirit consult unbiassed reason, and it will tell you that the Prophets were directed by the spirit of truth, which is one and the same in all times, and places; and the Philosophers under the influence of the spirit of error, which shifts with every wind.

From some texts in the Pentateuch, which appear to have been written after Moses's death, it was inferred that he was not the author of that work; but if it be considered that Moses foretold many things which happened after his death, this difficulty vanishes; he foresaw and foretold his death, and the manner of his death, why not his funeral? It is true that Moses speaks of himself in the course of the work as of an indifferent person, and even says that he was the most meek of men; it is not unusual for a writer to speak of himself in the third person: Cæsar gives us a specimen in his commentaries. As to the praise which Moses bestows on himself it was not from himself, but from the spirit of truth, which influenced and directed him, he in the same simple manner tells his infidelity at the waters of Meribah, and its consequent punishment death, before he entered the land of promise, which he so ardently desired. Never was book more authentic than the Pentateuch, nor author more certain than Moses: the whole Jewish nation attest it now, as they did at all times without a dissentient voice; their different sects of Pharisees, and Saducees and Libertines, Jews and Samaritans, though disagreeing in every thing else, all agree in this.

All the books, which have been written posterior

to

to the Pentateuch aſcribe it to Moſes: God ſays to Joſhua, 1 Ch. "take courage, and be very valiant to obſerve, and to fulfil the whole law, which my ſervant Moſes has commanded thee ..... let not the book of this law depart from thy mouth, and thou ſhalt meditate on it day and night, that thou mayeſt obſerve and do all things written in it. The law was therefore written before Joſhua took the command of the Children of Iſrael, and Moſes had delivered it. Four hundred and thirty eight years after, David immediately before his death ſays to his ſon Solomon, 3d. B. of K. Ch. 2. v. 3, "take courage, and be a man, that you may obſerve the obſervances of the Lord your God, that you may walk in his ways and keep his ceremonies, his precepts, his judgments, his teſtimonies as is written in the law of Moſes." The writer of the 4th B. of K. Chap. 21, enumerating the crimes of Manaſſes, ſays, that 'he placed an idol of the grove, which he had made in the temple of the Lord, of which the Lord had ſaid to David and to Solomon his ſon, in this temple and in Jeruſalem, which I have choſen out of all the tribes of Iſrael I will put my name for ever; and I will not remove the foot of Iſrael from this land, which I gave to their fathers, only if they will obſerve to do all, which I have commanded them according to the law, which my ſervant Moſes commanded them." The writer of the 2d. B. of Chronicles, ſpeaking of the celebrated Paſſover, which was obſerved in Joſias's reign, ſays that the ceremonies were obſerved "as is written in the book of Moſes."

In the 1ſt Eſdras, Chap. 3d, it is ſaid, "that they (the Jews) built the Altar of the God of Iſrael, that they might offer *holocauſts* upon it, as is written in the law of Moſes, the man of God." It is uſeleſs to cite more: all the writers of the Old Teſtament as well

as

as all the writers of the New Teſtament aſcribe the Pentateuch to Moſes. The Heathen authors aſcribe the Jewiſh religion to Moſes as do the Jews themſelves: Joſephus againſt Appion, Book 1ſt, adduces proofs of the Jewiſh antiquity from the writings of Phenecians, Egyptians and Greeks; and in his Antiquities of the Jews he eſtabliſhes that truth beyond the poſſibility of doubt.

Juſtin, the martyr, in his exhortation to the Greeks, proves to them, from the writings of their anceſtors, that Moſes was far more ancient than their ſages, their hiſtorians, their philoſophers or legiſlators. No. 10, he ſays, theſe things, O Greeks, writers, ſtrangers to our religion, have written concerning the antiquity of Moſes, and they ſaid that they had them from the Egpytian prieſts amongſt whom Moſes was born.

Tatian, in his oration againſt the Greeks, ſays, No. 26, "let Homer be preſent at the Trojan war, and let him have fought with Agamemnon, or let him, if any man deſires it, have lived before letters are ſaid to be found, it is yet manifeſt that Moſes was many years prior to the deſtruction of Troy, as he flouriſhed long before the building of that city, as witneſſes of this truth I ſhall adduce Chaldeans, Phenecians and Egyptians. He proceeds to cite theſe authors, Nos. 36, 37, 38, and No. 41, ſhews that Moſes is more ancient than all the writers known to us before Homer.

Theophilus, in his third book to Autolicus, No. 20 and 21, ſhews the antiquity of Moſes from the writings of Manethon, a famous Egyptian prieſt, which were then extant, but are now loſt. "Though," ſays Theophilus, "he tells many fabulous tales in favour of the Egyptians, and uttered blaſphemies againſt Moſes, and the Hebrews who followed him,

yet from his account it appears that they were nine hundred years before the Trojan war.

Origenes, in his memorable work againſt Celſus the Heathen philoſopher, writes thus, B. 1, No. 16, "I wonder that Celſus, who ranks the Odryſes, the Samothracians, the Hyperborean Cluſini amongſt the moſt wiſe, and ancient nations, does not deign to give the Jews a place either amongſt wiſe, or ancient people, though there be many Egyptians, Pheneci-ans and Greeks, who atteſt their antiquity. It would be uſeleſs to adduce theſe writers whom any perſon may ſee in Joſephus' two books of the Antiquities of the Jews: there many are collected by the author, who give teſtimony of the antiquity of the Jews. The book of the younger Tatian againſt the Gentiles is in every body's hands; in it he, with great eru-dition, adduces the hiſtorians who atteſt the antiquity of Moſes and the Jews. It is therefore certain that Celſus has no regard to truth, that he is influenced by a ſpiteful hatred to the Chriſtian religion, which derives from the Jews." A man would imagine that this intelligent writer reaſoned againſt a modern phi-loſophiſt. There is however this difference between Celſus and our modern ſcribblers, that Celſus was deeply verſed in all the ſciences taught in the Heathen ſchools, and offered in defence of error the plauſible reaſons, which his imagination furniſhed; they on the contrary, ignorant in the extreme, are reduced to collect the fragments of his works which yet re-main. Theſe they obtrude on the uninformed as the fruits of their deep reſearches into antiquity.

Men of real ſcience minutely diſcuſſing every ex-preſſion of the Pentateuch, in order to remove that obſcurity, in which events of remote antiquity muſt appear immerſed to the generality of readers, have indirectly enabled our Sciolists to add to theſe frag-ments

ments ſome other ſeeming difficulties againſt the authenticity of that work: thus, for example, it is ſaid in Deut. i. 1, "theſe are the words which Moſes ſpoke to Iſrael beyond the Jordan." Hence it is inferred that this book was written by ſome perſon after the Iſraelites had paſſed the Jordan, but in the original text it is *Beheber* which ſignifies in the paſſage, or oppoſite the paſſage of Jordan, and the ſenſe is determined by the context: the author immediately adds: "in the wilderneſs in the ſolitude oppoſite *Suph*, the Red Sea, between Pharan, and Thophel, and Laban, and Chaſoreth," that is in the wilderneſs where Moſes had given his inſtructions to the anceſtors of theſe men, to whom they were then repeated.

As the laws, which Moſes recapitulated in the book of Deuteronomy and others, which he then ſubjoined, were to be read on every ſeventh year for ſucceeding generations, the ſacred penman ſpeaking of himſelf, might with great propriety have ſaid, "theſe are the words, which Moſes ſpoke beyond the Jordan," hence the tranſlator was perfectly correct, though he did not give preciſely the ſenſe of the original text.

From this and ſimilar expreſſions ſome thought Eſdras author of the Pentateuch, though in his writings the contrary be manifeſt: it is ſaid, 1ſt Eſd. iii. 2, "Joſhua the ſon of Joſedee aroſe and his brethren the prieſts . . . . . and they built an altar of the God of Iſrael to offer *holocauſts* on it, as it is written in the law of Moſes *Bethorath Moſcheh*, and v. 18, they appointed Prieſts in their orders, and Levites in their turns over the works in Jeruſalem, as it is written in the book of Moſes." The text ſays "as the book of Moſes has written." *Chi chathab ſepher Moſcheh.* This order was given by Moſes, Num. iii. and viii.

In

In the 2d. of Eſd. viii. we read: "the Scribes ſaid to Eſdras, bring the book of the law of Moſes: *Lehabi eth Sepher Thorath Moſcheh* . . . . And Eſdras the Prieſt brought the law . . . . and they read in the book, in the law of the Lord, *Beſepher Bethorath*, diſtinctly and intelligibly. In the text *ſom ſechel*, that is giving the ſenſe of its contents. After the captivity, few if any of the people taken from Judea remained, their children born in Chaldea had corrupted the language of their anceſtors; mixing it with Chaldaic terms, and phraſes, they formed the Syriac language, which they continued to ſpeak to the deſtruction of their Republic. The Hebrew text written by Moſes many of them did not underſtand, Eſdras explained it to them in the language which they underſtood, but left the writen text as he found it. This appears evidently from the many Chaldaic words in the books written by Eſdras, not one of which are to be found in the Pentateuch. It is probable that many copies of the Scripture were deſtroyed when the city and temple were conſumed by fire, but there was an immenſe number of copies in the hands of the Prophets, Prieſts and Levites who eſcaped. It was ordered by Moſes, Deut. XVII. that the King ſhould tranſcribe the law from a copy atteſted genuine by the Prieſts of the Levitical Tribe. Their atteſtation was ſufficient to authenticate the copy. Many copies muſt have been in their hands, nor were they confined to the Tribe of Levi: Moſes gave copies to all the heads of families, Deut. XXXI. It is not in the nature of things that ſo many copies, and authentic tranſcripts, of a book, which contained the public records of the nation, determined the rites and ceremonies of the national religion, ſhould have periſhed.

Names of cities grown obſolete might have been changed with great propriety, though of this we

have

have no certainty; the names now in the text might have pre-exiſted: thus it is ſaid in Gen. XIV. 14, "Abraham purſued them (the men who had taken Lot) as far as *Dan*." It would appear from Jud. XVIII. that, this city, in Moſes's time called *Lais*, received the name of *Dan* from the 600 men of that Tribe, who robbed Micha of his idol. If Moſes had written *Lais*, Dan might have been ſubſtituted in after times without any inconvenience. It is more probable that Moſes ſpoke not of the city but of the fountain called Dan: we know from Joſephus, Lib. 1 Cap. 10. de Ant, that the Jordan took its name from two fountains the one called *Jor* the other *Dan*. Moſes adds, ibid. "that Abraham overcame them, and purſued them as far as Chobah to the left of Damaſcus, which place is near the ſources of the Jordan."

In like manner, Hebron which is frequently mentioned in the Pentateuch, is thought to have received its name from *Hebron*, ſon to Caleb after Moſes's death, it had been called of old *Caraith Arbe*, Joſhua XIV. It is plain from the context that it was called Hebron before Caleb's ſon poſſeſſed it; it was not from him therefore that it took the name, but from ſome chieftain of the Canaanites. Joſhua marks that it was called originally *Cariarth Arbe*, which might have been long before Moſes, as the city was built ſeven years before *Tanis*, the moſt ancient city in Egypt, Num. XIII. 23.

An expreſſion, not uncommon in Scripture, *the name continues to the preſent day*, ſeems to indicate a great lapſe of time between the event and the relation of it, yet we find it in St. Matthew who wrote ſhortly after the events, which he relates: "for this the field was called *Haceldama* the field of blood to the preſent day, XXVII. 8. And XXVIII. 15, "this

was

was divulged among the Jews to the preſent day." In the ſame manner Moſes had ſaid, Deut. III. 14, that the poſſeſſions of Jair, ſon of Manaſſes, were called *Havoth Jair*, that is the villages of Jair, *to the preſent day*, thereby ſignifying that no change had taken place in the name during the lapſe of ſome years previous to his writing.

Other expreſſions are found in the Pentateuch, which ſeem to indicate that the writer had lived after the expulſion of the Canaanites: thus it is ſaid, Gen. XII. 6, " Abraham paſſed over the land to the place of Sechem. The Canaanite was then in the land." And XIII. 7, " the Canaanite and Pherizite were then in the land." The writer if properly underſtood ſays ſimply that they were then eſtabliſhed in that country, *az Joſheb Baarets*, he neither ſays nor inſinuates that they had been expelled; he indirectly ſhews the Patriarch's faith and confidence in God, who ventured to ſojourn amongſt a wicked people, from whoſe enormity and rapacity he had every thing to fear.

Facts are related in the Pentateuch, which are thought to have happened after the death of Moſes, hence it is inferred by ſome Sciolifts that he was not the author, thus we read, Gen. XXXVI. " Theſe are the Kings who reigned in Edom before the children of Iſrael had a King." And in the XVI. of Exodus, " the Children of Iſrael eat manna 40 years until they came to the habitable land. They were ſupported by this food until they came to the borders of Canaan; we know from Joſhua, V. 12, that the manna did not ceaſe until after the death of Moſes, in the V. 12. of Deut. it is ſaid, " the Horrei dwelt in Seir, whom the Children of Eſau expelled, and deſtroyed and dwelt there, as Iſrael did in the land of their poſſeſſion." It is true many facts and events are related by Moſes, which

happened

happened after his death, the natural inference is that he was divinely inſpired: for there is but the preſcience of God, which extends to diſtant events depending on contingencies. Moſes therefore might have related the events adduced though taking effect after his death with the ſame certainty that he did many others at more diſtant periods, he foretold that the people of Iſrael after taking poſſeſſion of the promiſed land would conſtitute a King to reign over themſelves, and then preſcribed his duties, Deut. XVII. that they and their King would be carried into captivity, Deut. XXVIII. that there would be a certain place choſen by God for the building of his temple, in which he orders them to offer their ſacrifices not elſewhere, Deut. XII. he alſo charged them to exterminate Amalic when God would give them reſt in the country, which he would ſubject to them, this order was executed by Saul and David. It is not unuſual with the Prophets to ſpeak of events, which they know will infallibly happen, as already paſt. Hence Moſes might have related events, which he knew to be at hand, as if they had already happened. Thus he relates his death, the manner of his death, and the circumſtances attending it. In the ſame manner he might have related the events adduced, though it is probable that ſome of them happened before his death: from the death of Iſaac when Eſau took poſſeſſion of Edom to Moſes's appointment to the ſupreme command of Iſrael, two hundred and thirty ſix years had elapſed, in that time eight Kings might have reigned in Edom, and eleven Chieftains in different departments. That Moſes was King in Iſrael is manifeſt not only from his exerciſing regal authority, but becauſe he is expreſsly called *King* in the XXXIII. 5. of Deut. *va jahi bejishoovour melek.*

Long before his death the Children of Iſrael, had taken

taken poſſeſſion of the kingdoms of Og and Sehon. Moſes had ſaid, Deut. III. 12, 13, " at that time we paſſed the land from Aroer, which is on the bank of the brook Arnon, to the middle of the mountain of Galaad, theſe cities I gave to Reuben and Gad; the remainder of Galaad, and all Baſon of the kingdom of Og, I gave to the half tribe of Manaſſes." He might therefore have ſaid that the Children of Iſrael had expelled the former poſſeſſors of that land, as the children of Eſau had expelled the Horrei from Seir.

Joſeph in priſon had ſaid to Pharaoh's cup bearer that he was brought clandeſtinely from the land of the Hebrews, Gen. XL. This ſhadow is ſeized by our philoſophiſts: the land, ſay they, belonged to the Canaanites, it was called the land of Canaan. This is true of the country at large, but the Hebrews poſſeſſed a part: Abraham's deſcendants were then numerous from the lands which they poſſeſſed. Joſeph had been ſtolen. Add to this that Joſeph well knew that whole country had been promiſed to the Hebrews by God the Sovereign Diſpoſer of all countries. He therefore juſtly called it the land of the Hebrews.

There are in the Pentateuch expreſſions obſcure in themſelves, which are eaſily diſtorted from the intended ſignification. They have been minutely diſcuſſed, and all ſeeming inconſiſtencies ſatisfactorily reconciled, by men the moſt intelligent, and of the moſt profound erudition, a Toſtat, a Calmet, &c.

The malignity of a Celſus, of an apoſtate Julian, had recourſe to the fables of a Manethon, of a Cheremon; a man is ſurpriſed to hear Tacitus aſſert that the object of the Jewiſh worſhip was an aſs's head, this tale he borrowed from Appion's furious declamation againſt the Jews, who refuſed to erect ſtatues to Caligula, or to ſwear by his name. All theſe

fables

fables have been ſolidly refuted by Joſephus, in his books againſt Appion, by Origines againſt Celſus, by Cyril againſt Julian the apoſtate, and other early writers. It was reſerved for modern Sceptics to collect all the fragments of Heathen impiety from theſe works, in which they have been refuted, and to add all, that reſtleſs imagination can ſuggeſt in order to diminiſh, if poſſible, the force of that Divine revelation, which denouncing vengence againſt ſenſuality and vanity, the Philoſophiſt's idols, fills him with terrors and anxiety in this life, and devotes him to excruciating torments in the next.

A man, famous in the annals of modern philoſophy, writing to a brother Atheiſt, wiſhes him ſleep and a good appetite, the only Gods, ſaid he, which I adore. His Divinities were ungrateful: reſtleſs ambition, and its conſequent cares, and fatigues, had baniſhed ſleep from his wearied eyes, and ſatiety had depraved and ruined his voracious appetite, ſo true it is that the impious man is always the victim of his crimes: "*perſecutionem paſſi ab ipſis factis ſuis.*"

The five books of the Pentateuch are perfectly correſpondent, a partial interpolation in one, would have introduced an inconſiſtency with the others, and a total change was impoſſible. Why ſo? Becauſe in theſe books the religious rites and ceremonies of the Jewiſh people, and their civil polity were defined, and the miracles recorded in them were commemorated by ſolemn feſtivals; their deliverance from Egypt, by the feſtival of Eaſter, or, as they called it, the *Paſs over*, becauſe the exterminating Angel, ſeeing the blood of the Paſchal Lamb, paſſed over the houſes of the Iſraelites, whilſt he ſlew the firſt born in every houſe in Egypt, a peſtilence makes no diſtinction between the firſt born, and the ſecond or third. Hence the offering of the firſt born in the Temple, and the

aſſumption of the whole tribe of Levi in place of all the firſt born then in being. By what poſſibility could this whole tribe have been ſelected for the ſervice of the tabernacle and the temple, and continue in that ſervice until the total deſtruction of the Jewiſh republic, in commemoration of this miracle, if no ſuch prodigy had been effected? In like manner the promulgation of the law on Mount Sinai was commemorated by the ſolemnity of Pentecoſt; and the Jews were taught to remember that their anceſtors lived in tents, by the Feaſt of Tabernacles. All the books of the Old Teſtament pre-ſuppoſe the law of Moſes, refer to it, teach the ſame morality, which is contained in it, though written in different ages there is a perfect coincidence. Copies of the Pentateuch were given to all heads of families, Deut. XXXI. They were ordered to meditate on the law, and inſtruct their children in it, Deut. VI. It is cited in a ſpecial manner by Joſua I. III. XXIII. in the 3 Kings II. in the 4 Kings, XIV. XXIII. Eſdras, VIII. Eccl. XXIV. and elſewhere, ſuch was the zeal of the Jews in defence of this law, that they ſacrificed life itſelf rather than renounce it: read the hiſtory of the Maccabees: we know with what relentleſs fury they perſecuted the Chriſtians, who firſt taught that the ceremonial part of the law was abrogated, no change, therefore or interpolation was poſſible during the Jewiſh diſpenſation; after the eſtabliſhment of chriſtianity, if the Jews intended to interpolate or falſify, the Chriſtians would not permit them.

Moſes after he had given copies of the law to the prieſts and to all the heads of families, and ordered it to be read for the people every ſeventh year at the feſtival of Tabernacles, directed the Levites to depoſit the original in the ſide of the Ark of the covenant, "it will, ſaid he, be there a witneſs againſt you, *haja ſham*

ſham leēd beka, Deut. XXXI. This original *by the hand of Moſes*, 2 Par. XXXIV. 14, which probably was concealed from the fury of Manaſſes and Amon in ſome receſs of the temple, was found by Helkias the high prieſt in the reign of Joſias, 4 Kings, XXII, that Prince amazed and terrified ordered Helkias and others to inquire of the Lord by ſome Prophet, if the calamities denounced againſt the diſobedience of the Jews in the law were then impending. It was anſwered by Holda the propheteſs in the affirmative, ibid. From the amazement and terror of this pious Prince, it is inferred by ſome, that the law had been then forgotten, not reflecting that theſe calamities were at all times known to be denounced againſt diſobedience, yet cauſed no apprehenſion until the appearance of that original by the hand of Moſes, which was depoſited as a witneſs againſt them, from which it was very natural to conclude that the threatened evils were then at hand. Joſias had an additional motive to fear the impending calamities: his father Amon, and his grand father Manaſſes, had publicly profeſſed idolatry, had erected altars to the heathen deities in the temple, and had filled the city with the blood of the faithful who ſteadily adhered to the law, 4 Kings XXI.

To imagine that, becauſe this original in the hand-writing of Moſes was concealed during the turbulent reigns of Manaſſes and Amon, the numberleſs copies and authentic tranſcripts in the hands of the Prieſts, of the Prophets, of the heads of families in the different cities and towns of Judea, were all deſtroyed, is a mere groundleſs conjecture. We know that Joſias was himſelf inſtructed in the law before he ſaw this original: it is ſaid of him, 2 Par. XXXIV. That in the eighth year of his reign, the ſixteenth of his age, he began to ſeek the God of his father David,

and

and the writer of the 4th of Kings, fays, XXII. That he walked in all the ways of his father David, he declined neither to the right nor the left," he muſt have been well inſtructed in that law, which he ſo ſcrupulouſly obſerved from the 8th year of his reign to the 18th when the autograph of Moſes was found in the temple, ibid.

It is ſaid of Joas, that, at his inauguration, the *teſtimony*, that is, the Book of the Law, was put into his hands when he was anointed by the High Prieſt Joiada, 4. K. XI. 13. This ceremony muſt have been obſerved at the inauguration of all their Kings, as it was expreſsly commanded, Deut. XVII. By this law the King was obliged to tranſcribe the whole of Deuteronomy from a copy delivered to him by the High Prieſt, though ſome of their Kings may well be ſuppoſed not to comply with the precept, the greater number did, hence the law could not be forgotten in the court, much leſs in the temple, and the public ſchools, where it was diligently taught and explained by the Jewiſh Prieſts and Doctors. During the long reign of Ezechias the law was ſtrictly obſerved, and though his immediate ſucceſſor Manaſſes, in the early part of his reign, had introduced idols into the temple, and perſecuted the faithful, yet after his captivity he removed them, and ſteadily perſevered in the obſervance of the law to his death, 2. Par. XXXIII. His ſucceſſor Amon reigned but two years, during which time, however well diſpoſed, he could not obliterate the law. Joſias's reign was long. From his death to the invaſion of Nebuchonoſor but four years elapſed; this ſhort ſpace, and the whole time of the captivity, which followed, was celebrated by the writings and inſtructions of the great Prophets Jeremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, Habaccuc, &c. who not only obſerved the law of Moſes, and preſerved that, and the writings of former

former prophets, but added to them the books which bear their names.

Daniel was yet living when Cyrus took poſſeſſion of Babylon, Dan. V. Who in the firſt year of his reign ſent Zorobabel ſon of Salathiel, and Joſua the ſon of Joſedee, the high prieſt, with all the Prieſts, Levites and others, who were deſirous of returning to Jeruſalem, in order to build the temple. That theſe were well verſed in the law we know from, 1 Eſd. III. 2, where it is ſaid, "and Joſua the ſon of Joſedee, and his brethren the Prieſts, ſtood up, and Zorababel ſon of Salathiel and his brethren, and they built an altar of the God of Iſrael, to offer on it *holocauſts*, as is written in the law of Moſes the man of God." That the records of the nation were regularly kept is plain from this, that ſome, who aſcended could not prove their deſcent; and that the ſons of the Prieſts, that is the children of Hobai, who could not produce the record of their geneology were diſmiſſed from the Prieſthood: "They ſought the writing of their geneology, and did not find it, and were rejected from the Prieſthood." 1 Eſd. II. 62. If the regiſtry of births and marriages was kept, it is a wild conjecture to think that the book of the law, the public record of the whole nation, was loſt, or that the ſcriptures, in the hands of both Prieſts and Prophets, were deſtroyed.

In Zorobabel's time we find the Prophets Aggeus and Zacharias inſtructing and encouraging the people. Theſe men did not loſe ſight of the law, nor did they permit the prophetic writings of their predeceſſors to be forgotten, deſtroyed or interpolated; ſhortly after Eſdras was appointed to conduct the Jews. He was thought by ſome good men, deceived by rabbinical fables, to have reinſtated the whole of the Scriptures; there might have been inaccuracies in-

different

different copies through the neglect, inadvertence or ignorance of tranſcribers, which he corrected; and he is thought, upon good grounds, to have ſubſtituted the Chaldaic to the primitive Hebrew characters, in order to break the intercourſe between the Jews and Samaritans, who always retained the old Hebrew character in the Pentateuch, the only part of the Scriptures in their hands; but the Scriptures were in the hands of the Prieſts, the natural guardians, and keepers of right of theſe public records before his time, in his time, and after it, and they will continue in the hands of their ſucceſſors in office, until the end of time.

The authenticity of the *Old Law* received additional force from the *New*: the latter being the completion and perfection of the former. All the Moſaic rites and ceremonies were figurative of the Chriſtian diſpenſation. It was promiſed by all the Prophets, the moſt remarkable event, immediately preceding the eſtabliſhment announced by the patriarch Jacob, Gen. XLI. 10. The time determined by Daniel, IX. 24. The inſtitution, therefore, literally verifying theſe prophecies, ſhews them to have been divinely inſpired, it is therefore more than ſufficient to ſilence impiety, if impiety, the reſult of ignorance, vanity and ſenſuality, could be ſilent.

The revelation contained in the books of the New Teſtament, if conſidered attentively, and diſpaſſionately, will appear of divine original. The ſimplicity of its ſtyle invites and charms, whilſt the ſublimity of its truths, the perfection of its maxims, the obſcurity of its myſteries, aſtoniſh the true Philoſopher; it intelligibly inſtructs him in all his duties, whilſt it teaches him to captivate his underſtanding, and fix the inconſtancy of his will; it ſhews him the neceſſity of confining his reaſon to objects within his ſphere,

and

and the danger of launching out into the regions of imagination in purſuit of diſcoveries, which reaſon cannot make.

In this revelation the Philoſopher finds, and the child with equal certainty and eaſe, that God is the Creator of all things, viſible and inviſible: all things were made by him, John i. that he alone poſſeſſes immortality from the neceſſity of his nature, that to the created intelligence he is incomprehenſible: "who alone poſſeſſes immortality and dwells in inacceſſible light," 1ſt. Tim. VI. 16; that his power and divinity is eternal, Rom. i. 20; that he is perfectly immutable in his decrees as in his nature: with whom there is no change nor ſhadow of viciſſitude, James i. 17; that he is perfectly free and totally independent on his creatures: "who was his counſellor? Or who hath given to him previouſly, and a recompence ſhall be made? From him, and by him, and to him are all things," Rom. XI. 35, 36. That as firſt beginning and laſt end he is alſo the Sovereign Arbiter of all his creatures, diſpoſing of them according to his will: "who worketh all things according to the counſel of his will, Eph. i. 11; that his providence ſuperintends and directs the univerſe, ſo that nothing can happen without his immediate direction: a ſparrow is not forgotten by him, Luke xii. 6. He feeds the birds of the air, ibid. Not one of them falls to the ground but by his order, Matt. x. 29. The hairs of our heads are numbered by him, and under his inſpection, ibid.; that he alone is poſſeſſed of immenſity: "in him we live, and are moved, and exiſt," Acts XVII. 28; that his mercy knows no bounds; hence the Apoſtle calls him Father of Mercies, 2. Cor. i. 3: "be you merciful as your father is merciful," Luke vi. 3, 6: "for the Lord is merciful and compaſſionate," James v. 11; "that he

is

is juſt and true in all his ways: "thy ways are juſt and true, King of Ages," Rev. XV. 3; that he is the avenger of crimes: "vengeance is mine and I will repay," Rom. XII. 19:" the Lord knows how to deliver the godly from temptation, but to reſerve the unjuſt to the day of judgment to be tormented," 2d Pet. ii. 9, in a word, that he is poſſeſſed of all perfection. This revelation after having given the moſt ſublime idea of God, which the mind can conceive, ſtates man's original dignity, and deſtination; then adds the ſource of all the calamities, to which he is ſubject in his fallen ſtate; the prevarication of our firſt parents: "by one man ſin entered into the world, and by ſin death," Rom. v. 12, hence; that innumerable train of conſequent evils, which terminate in that greateſt of all evils death. Thus the unlearned find, what the Heathen Philoſophers ſought in vain, the cauſe of that violent inclination to ſenſible objects, the emptineſs and vanity of which, though known to the Heathens was not ſufficient to check the ardour of their wild purſuits. In this, however, they were more excuſable than their ſucceſſors, our modern Scioliſts, of whom it cannot be ſaid that they did not know, but that perverſe obſtinacy, and unbridled ſenſuality has effaced from their minds a truth which they muſt have known.

If it be neceſſary to know the ſource of our woes, it is of yet greater conſequence to know the remedy; in this revelation we find it; the boundleſs mercy, and inexpreſſible goodneſs of God, has given us a Redeemer, who at the expence of his blood has reconciled us. From this revelation we know that his ſatisfaction was full and ſufficient; that when applied to us by faith, and the ſacraments of his inſtitution, it perfectly reinſtates us; that we may have recourſe to it, if neceſſary, more than once in the courſe

courſe of life. From this revelation we know the homage which God exacts: "God is a Spirit, and they who adore him muſt adore him in ſpirit and truth," John IV. 24. "Thou ſhalt love the Lord, thy God, with thy whole heart, and with thy whole ſoul, and with all thy ſtrength, and with all thy mind," Luke X. 27," that is, in two words: thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God ſincerely, and in preference to every thing which is not God. Though this precept, which radically includes all other precepts, be extremely difficult, yet the reaſon is irreſiſtible, and the precept is indiſpenſable on the principles of reaſon: our love to any object ought to be proportioned to the goodneſs of the object in itſelf, and our gratitude proportioned to favours received. God is in himſelf the ſource of all goodneſs; from him, and at his will, we hold all, that we poſſeſs, our exiſtence, and its continuance; to him, therefore, we owe the homage of our ſouls and bodies, of our underſtanding, our will, of all that we poſſeſs. To our obedience he promiſes a reward great beyond meaſure: that is, the light of glory, which will ſhew us truth in itſelf, goodneſs and beauty in its ſource; againſt diſobedience this revelation denounces the moſt terrific ſentence, that is an eternal excluſion from this light of glory accompanied with other torments proportioned to the number and enormity of tranſgreſſions. "That you may be judged worthy of the kingdom of God, for which alſo you ſuffer; ſeeing it is juſt with God to repay affliction to thoſe, who oppreſs you, and to you, who are oppreſſed relaxation with us, when the Lord Jeſus ſhall be revealed from Heaven with the Angels of his power in a flame of fire, giving puniſhment to thoſe, who know not God, and who do not obey the goſpel of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt,

who ſhall ſuffer eternal pains in deſtruction from the face of the Lord, and from the glory of his power," 2. Theſs. I. 5. and ſeq.

To create man's confidence, it repreſents this our God ſo great, ſo powerful, ſo rich in mercy, as an indulgent father: our father who art in Heaven, Matt. vi. 9. "ſee the grace which the father has given us, that we ſhould be called the children of God.....we are now the children of God," 1 John. iii. 1, 2.

To engage us to have recourſe to him, it promiſes that whatever we aſk conducing to our welfare, now and hereafter, he will grant it, "whatever you aſk the father in my name, that will I do," John xiv, 13.

To prevent deſpair when paſſion overpowers, or the tempter ſeduces, it promiſes pardon to ſincere repentance, nor does it confine this grace to any limited number of transgreſſions, or to any limited number of times, "whoſe ſins you forgive they are forgiven," John xx. 23.

The incertainty of the term of accompt, is propoſed as a check to preſumption: "Be you then alſo ready, for at what hour you think not the ſon of man will come," Luke xii. 40.

In this revelation we find all the perfections which human reaſon, neither warped by prejudice, nor clouded by paſſion, may diſcover, and others to which reaſon unaſſiſted by a ſuperior light cannot extend, we find all the duties which theſe perfections impoſe, and alſo all the relative duties, which man's place in the creation, and his original deſtination, aſſign him. As a child of God and heir to his Kingdom, he is ordered to perſiſt in the exerciſe of all theſe virtues, which adorn the ſoul, and give it a diſtant reſemblance to its heavenly father, univerſal benevolence without diſtinction of friends or enemies: "thou ſhalt love thy neighbour as thyſelf," Matt. xix. 19;

"Love

"Love your enemies, do good to thoſe who hate you, bleſs thoſe who curſe you, and pray for thoſe who calumniate you....and you ſhall be the children of the moſt high, for he is beneficent to the unthankful and to the wicked," Luke vi. 33...Mercy: "Be you merciful becauſe your father is merciful," 36. Humility and meekneſs: "Learn from me for I am meek and humble of heart," Matt. xi. 29.

In this quality of child of God ſanctity is ſtrictly enjoined, which excludes every poſſible vice: "ſeek peace with all men, and ſanctification, without which no man will ſee God," Heb. xii. 14. Chaſtity is in a particular manner enjoined: "the oppoſite vice being from its nature incompatible with ſanctity excludes from the inheritance of the children of God," 1. Cor. vi.

In this revelation man is taught his abſolute, and relative duties, in every ſituation of life; as a prince, as a ſubject, as a magiſtrate, a citizen, as a father, a huſband, as a free man, a bondman; every age, every ſex, every range of life, find in it rules of conduct, which extort the approbation of impiety. It is true our ſciolifts complain of the rigid ſeverity of its maxims; highway-men complain of the ſeverity of the laws. The laws, which proportion puniſhments to the atrocity of crimes are not the leſs wiſe though the highway-man may think otherwiſe; the maxims of the Goſpel are not the leſs venerable becauſe impiety diſregards them: if they countenanced impiety, they would ceaſe to be what they are, that is, maxims of holineſs, worthy the ſanctity and wiſdom of their author; they alſo complain of the obſcurity of its myſteries. In this they ſhew their ignorance: of all myſteries that of the Trinity is the moſt obſcure; yet 'tis not more difficult to conceive the divine nature in three perſons than in one; the divine nature is in itſelf and in all its attributes impenetrable to the created

ted underſtanding. It is not more ſo in three perſons than in one : the man who pretends to meaſure the immenſity of the divinity by his own limited underſtanding expoſes both his pride and ignorance at the ſame time.

From ſome expreſſions in the inſpired writings, which intimate that God extends his mercy to ſome, whilſt he exerciſes the ſeverity of his juſtice on others ; that he ſeems deſirous of ſaving ſome, not others ; that he confers extraordinary favors on ſome, and ſends afflictions and calamities to others, the ſpirit of error pretends to concludeagainſt the authenticity of the work, ſuch partiality being, ſay its abettors, inconſiſtent with juſtice. It has been already obſerved that juſtice does not exelude clemency ; that God is not ſaid to be ſovereignly juſt becauſe he never pardons, but becauſe he is ſtrictly obſervant of the rules of juſtice in his judgments: he never condemns the innocent, nor does the puniſhment, which he inflicts on the delinquent, exceed the malice of the offence. If on condition of ſincere repentance he forgives an offender, it is an act of mercy, from which none are excluded, but theſe, who exclude themſelves. The obſtinate delinquent, and ſincere penitent are not equally entitled to mercy : clemency pleads for the one, while juſtice claims the other. In this there is nothing which reaſon does not approve.

That God deſires to ſave ſome, not others, is not true : he ſincerely deſires to ſave all, as is expreſsly marked in the Scriptures : St. Paul directs his diſciple Timothy to have prayers and ſupplications offered up for all men : " for this is good and acceptable in the ſight of God our Saviour, who wills all men to be ſaved," 1. Tim. II. 3—4. Why then are not all men ſaved, ſince God's will is irreſiſtible ? God's abſolute will is irreſiſtible ; but he does not abſolutely will to ſave

ſave men againſt their will; he ſincerely deſires them to be ſaved, if they will co-operate with the aſſiſtance which he offers, and have recourſe to the means which he has inſtituted for that end. There is nothing more reaſonable.

That he confers extraordinary favours on ſome is true, that he afflicts others is equally true. In the diſtribution of extraordinary favours there can be no injuſtice, no acceptation of perſons: where there is no title there can be no claim. In this diſtribution he manifeſts the riches of his magnificence, and his perfect independence on his creatures, liberally beſtowing favours without merit, or title, according to his will. If he afflicts the juſt man, it is to chaſtiſe paſt iniquity, or to prevent foreſeen tranſgreſſions, or perhaps to diſengage his affections from a life, in which there is nothing but emptineſs and vanity; if he ſends calamities to the impious, it is to puniſh, or reſtrain evil, rightly conſidered it is rather an act of mercy than of juſtice. The untimely end of a remorſeleſs Tyrant prevents him from adding to his iniquity, and thereby encreaſing the meaſure of his torments, which Divine juſtice will proportion to the number and enormity of his exceſſes.

Words being the ſigns of ideas, as we can have no adequate idea of the Divinity, or of the Divine attributes, we can have no terms to expreſs them correctly. From this limitation of our ideas, and conſequent defect in our language, the terms in uſe being appropriated to objects, which we know, convey our thoughts, but are not ſufficiently expreſſive of the Divine nature; hence the neceſſity of underſtanding all expreſſions applied to the Divinity in the moſt perfect ſenſe, and excluding every imperfection and limitation which the expreſſion applied to its appropriate object may convey. This defect in language

language has introduced the neceſſity of having recourſe to metaphorical expreſſions, theſe are multiplied for ornament, as well as uſe, in all languages, more particularly amongſt the Orientals. The Scriptures abound with ſtrong metaphors, thereby ſupplying the native defect of language, and conveying an idea of the magnificence and power of God, which though not commenſurate with either, is the utmoſt effort of the human mind. In theſe metaphorical expreſſions, the different paſſions of anger, of jealouſy, of indignation, of repentance, &c. are aſcribed to the Divinity, by which no more is ſignified, or intended, but that God's conduct to the obedient, or diſobedient, appears ſuch as ours, in ſimilar circumſtances, under the influence of theſe paſſions, which are incompatible with the Divine nature, which of courſe he cannot feel.

Ignorance only can miſtake theſe metaphorical expreſſions, which aſcribe hands, eyes, &c. to the Divinity: when, in common diſcourſe, we ſay of a man that his head is good, we are underſtood to ſpeak of the ſtrength of his underſtanding, or if we ſay, his heart is bad, it is underſtood of the perverſeneſs of his will. Thus the arm of God, conveys an idea of his power, the throne of God, ſignifies his majeſty, the eyes of God, his providential vigilance over his creatures, and attention to them.

In the new law are found ambiguous expreſſions, which are thought favourable to diſſenting ſects of Chriſtians, even to Deiſts, Mahometans and Atheiſts. This, if we believe our Scioliſts, is a prejudice againſt the law.

In the new law are ſome expreſſions, which, from the nature of the ſublime truths which they convey, are obſcure, others, which the perverſe obſtinacy of diſſenting ſects, diſtorts from their intended ſignification,

tion, affixing to them a ſenſe, which coincides with their pre-conceived opinions; many, who will not ſhape their conduct according to the maxims of the law, impiouſly endeavour to ſhape the law according to the maxims of their conduct. In the law there is no defect, no danger; in the perverſeneſs of their own will they find ruin. If inſtead of diſtorting the law to their opinions, and bending it to their will, they would correct their errors by the law, and conform their will to its dictates, they would find in it a ſource of happineſs, and all diſſentions would ceaſe.

To inſtitute a compariſon between the heathen morality, and that of the chriſtian law, is a groſs abſurdity: their pretended divinities were the inventions of fancy, infected with all the vices, to which their inventors were addicted; the moſt violent and deſtructive paſſions were perſonified, and honored with temples, in which crimes, at which nature recoils, were committed, not only with impunity, but with religious ſolemnity. Amongſt their great divinities were parricides, proſtitutes, drunkards, bullies. Even the highway-man had recourſe to his mercury for ſucceſs in his undertakings.

Theſe pretended divinities by their example authorized and encouraged licentiouſneſs, and the miniſters of their temples by their precepts and their religious rites. Tatian, in his oration againſt the Greeks, No. 20, ſays: "I diſregarded your inſtitutions, becauſe there ought to be but one common form of living; amongſt you there are as many different inſtitutions as there are cities; actions infamous in the one are honorable in others." Matrimonial connections with mothers are forbidden amongſt the Greeks, they are honored by the Perſians; ſodomy is condemned by the Barbarians, authorized by the Romans, for whoſe pleaſures flocks of boys are brought to market

market like horſes. Such was the morality of the predeceſſors of our modern philoſophiſts. The man who approves will imitate when the occaſion offers. It is rather unlucky for the modern race of heathens, that in chriſtian countries the laws will not permit them to imitate their anceſtors with impunity.

That in the works of the Heathen philoſophers there are ſome precepts of morality is true. Firſt principles of the natural law are deeply impreſſed in the mind; they are not eaſily effaced; the conſequences, which are immediately inferred from theſe principles, the heathen philoſophers found, not in accredited fables, but in the light of reaſon, which was not totally extinct; remote conſequences are of more difficult acceſs: their precepts did not extend to them; if any did, they were borrowed from the ſcriptures: "which of your poets, or which of your ſophiſts," ſaid Tertullian in his apology, "did not drink of the fountain of the prophets?" The moral precepts of Epictetus are manifeſtly borrowed from the Goſpel, which he muſt have ſeeen, yet the pretended virtues of this celebrated ſtoic are as oppoſite to true chriſtian virtues as darkneſs to light: Virtuous actions are diſtinguiſhed by their motives; that of the chriſtian is univerſal benevolence; that of the ſtoic, the moſt refined ſelf love and cold inſenſibility, his invariable maxim is "think of yourſelf; ſacrifice every thing to yourſelf." In the corrupt ſyſtem of Epicurus there is no maxim more baſe or dangerous to ſociety.

To their moral precepts the heathen ſages added the moſt groſs errors; thus we find the famed Plato directing the inhabitants of his imaginary republic to take their wives in common; add to this, that their precepts were confined to men of ſcience, the eloquence of a Plato, or of a Cicero, the philoſophical reaſoning

reaſoning of an Ariſtotle, the lectures of a Socrates, or a Seneca are uſeleſs to the unlettered Peaſant. In the inſpired writings rules of action are taught in language intelligible to all claſſes without diſtinction; and by the inſtitution of miniſters, ample proviſion made for the inſtruction of the moſt illiterate; hence the unlettered chriſtian knows all his relative duties with greater preciſion than the heathen philoſopher.

It is frequently urged againſt the evangelical law, that its precepts are ſevere; that they preſcribe a total mortification of our ſenſes and paſſions; that an exact obſervance of them is inconſiſtent with the laws and welfare of ſociety; ruinous to trade and population; inimical to arts and ſciences; encouraging apathy, inſenſibility, alienation of affection from our parents, friends and country.

It is admitted that the precepts of the evangelical law are ſtrict and even ſevere; they enjoin every virtue, and prohibit every vice, denouncing vengeance againſt iniquity under the purple or in rags, without diſtinction, or diſcrimination. They exact ſanctity, becauſe their author is holy, and their object is to ſanctify; if they countenanced vice they would be unworthy of ſuch an author, and unfit for his purpoſe.

There is nothing more reaſonable than the mortification which they enjoin: to repreſs the tumultuous paſſions of anger, avarice, ambition, envy, jealouſy, ſenſuality, and vanity, ſo fatal to mankind, argues the perfection of the Law, and the wiſdom of the Legiſlator, who applies the remedy to the ſource of the evil. The man, who pretends that to gratify theſe paſſions is either lawful, laudable, innocent or uſeful, is not to be reaſoned with, but confined with lunatics, or malefactors.

If the Chriſtian be told in the Goſpel that he muſt

hate his father and mother, the ſenſe of the precept is obvious : that is, if they order any thing contrary to the Law of God, or the Law of the Land, he muſt not obey them ; if they endeavour to divert him from the duty, which he owes this Univerſal Father, he muſt diſregard their injunctions, but yet remember that in all things, not contrary to the Law of God, he muſt love and obey them : the Chriſtian who knows that he muſt love his enemies, cannot think of hating his parents or friends, but he muſt not prefer them to his God ; hence the Redeemer ſays, Matt. X. 37 : " he that loves his father or his mother better than me, is not worthy of me."

This reaſoning is applicable to many other precepts of the ſame nature : thus the injunction of renouncing all poſſeſſions in the world to be a true diſciple of Chriſt is underſtood of the diſpoſition of the mind, and preparation of the heart, to ſacrifice every thing, even life itſelf, rather than diſobey the Lord or deny him ; than which there is no precept more reaſonable : a man of honor would rather ſacrifice his life than betray his King or Country. The actual renunciation of wealth, or power, lawfully acquired, is not of precept, but of counſel, to which none are obliged but they who chuſe a more perfect ſtate of life : without it ſalvation is attainable : this appears from the Saviour's anſwer to the young man, who aſked what he ſhould do to be ſaved ? " If you wiſh to enter into life keep the commandments." After telling him the commandments, which muſt be obſerved, he adds. " if you deſire to be perfect, go ſell all you have, give to the Poor..... Come and follow me," Matt. XIX. The Saviour clearly diſtinguiſhes the precepts of indiſpenſable neceſſity to enter into life, from this counſel, by the obſervance of which. the young man would have arrived

arrived at a greater degree of perfection, and obtained what the Saviour called *a Treasure in Heaven.*

There are other precepts in the Gospel, which appear extremely severe, yet upon investigation they are found perfectly consistent with reason, and wisely instituted. Thus, when the Saviour says, Matt. V, "If a man strike you on the right cheek turn to him the other; if he contends with you in judgment for your coat, let him take your cloak also." Patience in injuries is enjoined; individuals are prohibited from doing themselves justice by private authority, than which there is nothing more reasonable. The public Magistrate is not forbidden to redress injuries, and do justice to the sufferer, on the contrary, he is ordered to do it: "he is the minister of God .... he does not hold the sword in vain ....., the avenger to execute wrath on him who doeth evil," Rom. XIII. 4—5. As the minister of God he exercises on criminals that vindictive justice, which belongs to God, and, of course, to these exclusively who are authorised by him: "Vengeance is mine and I will repay," Rom. XII. 19. Nor is the sufferer forbidden to have recourse to the public Magistrate for redress, if he be influenced by the love of justice, not by a desire of revenge, which is never lawful, and is at all times strictly prohibited. Vexatious law-suits are strictly forbidden. If redress can be obtained in justice without fraud, without injury to the adverse party, without hatred, animosity, slander, disunion, or breach of christian charity, it is not forbidden to institute a law-suit for redress of injury; if not it is prudent to decline it: because no redress, which can be obtained, is an equivalent for the Divine displeasure incurred by sin. This shews the wisdom of these counsels, which

which our Sciolists think severe, and even unreasonable.

That the evangelical law is inimical to arts and sciences is a groundless surmise, refuted by experience: if arts and sciences be known, it is in these countries where that law prevails; in the eastern countries the most barbarous ignorance has succeeded its suppression.

If fraud, usury and circumvention, be useful to trade; honesty, sincerity and plain dealing, destructive; or if unbounded licentiousness encrease population, whilst regularity ruins it, the evangelical law must be acknowledged defective; he must be fond of delusion who believes such nonsense, and may be consigned to his dreams without interruption.

That stoical apathy, insensibility and alienation of affection, which philosophists find in the evangelical law, was remarked by the heathens—its disciples were absent from the orgies of Bacchus; they were strangers to the mysterious rites of Ceres; their wives and daughters were not brought in solemn procession to the temple of Venus, nor did they range themselves amongst Gladiators; these fashionable amusements they resigned to the memorable ancestors of our modern sciolists. Why complain of us? We imitate our ancestors. They were insensible to criminal excesses, which the voice of reason condemns; but their affection to their parents, to their friends, to their country, their anxiety for their welfare, their exertions to procure relief in the public calamities, in a word, their charity knew no bounds; that is the apathy enjoined in the new law: this is a language which vanity and sensuality dislike.

Some have secluded themselves from society in penitential silence to atone for past offences, or to avoid dangerous occasions; others to contemplate the works

works of the divinity, the joys of heaven, the horrors of hell, the abyſs of eternity. The reader will pardon this unſeaſonable intruſion of terms ſo offenſive to the atheiſt, the deiſt, the modern philoſopher; for this ſecluſion there is no precept; we may admire, but are not obliged, in many caſes not allowed, to imitate them: what is laudable in one, is not ſo in all: if a man be free from all engagements he may live in retirement; if his cares be neceſſary to ſociety, he cannot do it with propriety, amongſt the diſciples of the evangelical law no man lives for himſelf: that privilege they reſign to pretended philanthrophiſts. The perfection, which the law requires, conſiſts in a ſtrict obſervance of its precepts. The obſervance of its councils may, and frequently does, remove impediments, it is therefore lawful and laudable but not neceſſary.

In this divine law the man of reflection diſcovers the ſource of all his calamities; he ſees the ſtate of infirmity, to which the unprovoked tranſgreſſion of the founder of the human race has reduced all his deſcendants; the clouds, which it has diffuſed in the underſtanding, and that ſtate of debility and inconſtancy, in which it has placed the will; the irreſiſtible inclination to ſenſible objects, the overbearing preſſure of concupiſcence, againſt which reaſon ſpeaks in vain: "I ſee and approve what is right, and do what is wrong," and what is yet of greater conſequence, in this law, he finds the only effectual remedy; he is taught to have recourſe to a God of mercy for aſſiſtance, whoſe grace diſpels the clouds of the underſtanding, fixes the inconſtancy of the will, heals its infirmity, inſures a power of reſiſtance ſuperior to the preſſure of concupiſcence, ſoftens theſe tumultuous paſſions, which torment the impious man, impoſes on them an abſolute ſilence, or at leaſt makes them ſubject to reaſon.

There

There are truths announced in this law which tranſcend reaſon, hence the ſcioliſt infers that they are contrary to reaſon. The inference only ſpeaks his ignorance: all truths, which regard the divinity, and the divine attributes, muſt of neceſſity tranſcend reaſon: becauſe the divine nature is not within the ſphere of reaſon's activity.

An aſſertion is contrary to reaſon, and contrary to truth, when the idea of the ſubject and the idea of the attribute, both preciſely known, exclude each other; thus to aſſert that a circle is a ſquare, is a manifeſt abſurdity, becauſe the known properties of theſe figures exclude each other; but if the eſſential properties of the ſubject, or of the attribute, be not accurately known, reaſon cannot pronounce whether they be conſiſtent or inconſiſtent, whether they exclude each other or not: thus when it is ſaid that in the divine nature there are three divine perſons, as the divine nature and the divine perſons are totally incomprehenſible to us, reaſon, unaſſiſted by a ſuperior light, can neither pronounce the propoſition true nor falſe; and as reaſon can inſtitute no compariſon between objects, which are known, and theſe which are not, ſo it can inſtitute no compariſon between objects within its graſp and theſe which tranſcend it, the length of a mile might be compared to the heat of the ſun with equal propriety, or rather with leſs abſurdity.

Though by reaſoning we cannot arrive at truths, which tranſcend the force of reaſon, or, if you will, of our limited faculty of reaſoning, yet there is nothing more reaſonable than to believe theſe truths on the authority of Revelation: a peaſant would be thought inconſiderate, if he refuſed to believe an inference deduced by an able mathematician from principles as inconceivable to the peaſant, as the truths of religion;

if he refuſed to believe the truth inferred until he clearly conceived the principles, he would be diſmiſſed with contempt as an obſtinate blockhead. The alluſion is juſt: many revealed truths are inferences from principles evident to the divinity, incomprehenſible to us. Men of true ſcience modeſtly admit the truth on the authority of the divine word; the ſcioliſt in imitation of the peaſant, whoſe obſtinacy is the natural reſult of pride, and ignorance, will not believe if he does not comprehend. The man of ſcience confines his reaſoning to the proper object: he does not preſume to contradict the divinity: he inquires whether the truth propoſed to his belief be revealed or not; whether the proofs adduced be ſufficient to found a prudential aſſent, if ſo he does not doubt the veracity of his Creator, knowing well that God can do what he cannot conceive, of this he has unqueſtionable evidence in all the works of God, not one of which he comprehends. The Scioliſt on the contrary conſults his pride not his reaſon: he does not inquire whether the propoſed truth be revealed or not, but as he cannot conceive principles, which are inconceivable, and will not admit that Almighty power tranſcends his own, or that truths are known to God of which he is ignorant, he rejects the truth without farther diſcuſſion. It is doubtful whether pride or ignorance be the more prominent feature in impiety. Nothing is wanted to make it contemptible.

The ſanctity of the law, and its tendency to perfect human nature, is manifeſt from the reaſons on which the Scioliſt founds his objections againſt it: the mortification which it preſcribes, ſays he, deſtroys the natural liberty of our will and all our faculties of action; the propoſal of incomprehenſible doctrines deprives us of the uſe of our underſtanding;

ing ; the injunction of reſting all our cares on Providence, reduces us to a ſtate of torpid inſenſibility. The contradictories would have been logically deduced from the principles admitted, if the Scioliſt knew how to reaſon. More than once we have been told by theſe ſcribblers, that man is a ſort of monkey. Their wild declamation reſembles the chattering of that miſchievous animal. However, as it is reaſon, which diſtingniſhes man from all other animals, even from Atheiſts and Deiſts if they be claſſed with monkeys, it is reaſon which determines human nature, hence whatever is under the direction of reaſon tends to perfect human nature, and whatever tranſgreſſes the bounds of reaſon, and contradicts its dictates, vitiates and corrupts it. If diſorderly affections be called paſſions, as they are contrary to order and the dictates of reaſon, they vitiate and corrupt ; virtue muſt exiſt without them. The mortification of theſe is therefore indiſpenſably neceſſary to perfect human nature ; but if the inclinations of the ſenſitive appetite be thought paſſions they are the ſubject matter to which the exerciſe of virtue is confined : virtue conſiſts in directing them to their proper objects, and preventing tranſgreſſions of the bounds, which reaſon preſcribes : in this conſiſts that mortification, which the evangelical law recommends. To direct the operations of the will, and all the powers of action ſubject to the will, is not to deſtroy its liberty, but to deliver it from ſlavery. Thus a man's liberty is not reſtrained becauſe he is not allowed to ſeduce his neighbour's wife, or forcibly ſeize his poſſeſſions : he poſſeſſes no ſuch liberty ; in the act his will is a ſlave to a diſorderly affection, which corrupts nature, becauſe it is contrary to that reaſon, which conſtitutes it.

Nature has wiſely annexed to all the operations neceſſary

neceſſary to the preſervation of the individual, and the conſervation of the ſpecies, a certain pleaſing ſenſation. Exceſſes and defects are forbidden by reaſon, as deſtructive of the end: hence intoxication and licentiouſneſs are evidently vicious: that mortification which retrenches them perfects human nature, or, at leaſt, prevents its corruption. The writer ſpeaks of men, not of monkeys, or of two-legged animals of the monkey kind

This reaſoning is applicable to the human underſtanding: It is perfected by truth, corrupted by falſhood; if truths be propoſed which tranſcend its limited force of action, and light be infuſed to increaſe its powers, inſtead of enſlaving the underſtanding this frees it from the dominion of error, enables it to act with greater energy, and diſcuſs, with greater accuracy, ſubjects within its own ſphere. Thus objects, which are inviſible to the naked eye, become viſible by the aſſiſtance of a glaſs; and objects which are already ſeen, become more clearly defined: in like manner the underſtanding, aſſiſted by a ſuperior light, not only diſcovers truths, which tranſcend its native powers, but alſo ſees more clearly theſe which are within its inveſtigation.

All faculties are to be confined to their proper objects: the eye is not made to hear, nor the ear to ſee, however the force of either may be increaſed; no extenſion of its powers can enable the eye to hear, or the ear to ſee, nor can they act at all without the aſſiſtance of light for the eye, and ſound for the ear.

As to that ſtate of inſenſibility to which religion reduces its votaries, it is merely imaginary: vain ſolicitude and excruciating anxiety are forbidden, the neceſſary cares and vigilance preſcribed. It is forbidden to make wealth or power the ultimate end of our purſuits: "do not lay up treaſures on earth.....but in

Heaven," Mat. VI, 19–20—It is not allowed to ſerve God in view of theſe; it is alſo forbidden to deſpair of divine aſſiſtance in lawful purſuits; "Your father knows that you want thoſe things," *ibid.* Confidence in our own exertions, independently on the divine aſſiſtance, is ſtrictly and juſtly prohibited; "Which of you can add to his ſtature one cubit?" *ibid.* An over anxious care, previous to the neceſſary time, is alſo forbidden: "Be not ſolicitous for to-morrow," *ibid.* The man who believes a Providence to exiſt, to ſuperintend and direct human affairs, attends to all the relative duties of his condition with vigilance and attention, and reſts on Providence for ſucceſs without anxiety or agitation.

As the great object of the evangelical law is to inſtruct, and conduct its votaries, by ſanctity of life, to a holy and ſupernatural end, its precepts are proportioned to that end; they enforce ſanctity beyond the reach of human laws; they, in order to eradicate evil, forbid all unlawful deſires, from theſe iniquitous actions reſult. Human laws are confined to actions which are public, they cannot reach the mind nor what is concealed. They puniſh the effect, but leave the cauſe untouched. Add to this, that the moral precepts of the Goſpel, which enforce the practice of virtue, are always proportioned to the powers of action in its diſciples, which in ſome are greater, in others leſs; for the powers of action in every agent reſult, or, at leaſt, are increaſed by the habit acquired, and this habit is ſtrengthened by a repetition of acts; hence a perſon advanced in virtue finds no difficulty in that which to the vicious is impracticable, and to theſe, who enter on a virtuous life, if not impracticable, extremely difficult. What is tolerable in the one is reprehenſible in the other. Human laws are made for the multitude, of whom a great majority are imperfect,

fect, if not vicious; they prohibit but ſuch actions as are prejudicial to ſociety: they cannot enforce the practice of virtue. The precepts of the divine law not only prohibit every poſſible vice, whether public, or private, whether in act, thought, word or deſire, but enjoin every virtue, in proportion as the powers of action, which are inceſſantly augmented in the virtuous man, encreaſe: "performing truth in charity, let us encreaſe in all things, in him who is the head, Chriſt," Eph. IV. 15. "Encreaſe in the knowledge of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt," 2. Pet. III. 18.

The ſanction of all human laws is defective; they can neither proportion puniſhments to the malignity of delinquents, nor rewards to the virtue of claimants; the motives and intentions of both eſcape the eye of human juſtice; hence actions, in themſelves vicious and reprehenſible, are ſometimes thought laudable, and as ſuch deemed worthy a reward, whilſt acts of heroic virtue are paſſed unnoticed, and not unfrequently treated with contempt.

The ſanction of the divine law is perfect, and ſpeaks the wiſdom of its author; vengeance is denounced againſt vice, by him, from whom no vicious thought is concealed; "all things are naked and open to his eyes," Heb. IV. 13. He will proportion the puniſhment to the number and the malignity of the delinquent's offences: "he will render to every man according to his works," Rom. II. 5. As an inducement to virtue, rewards are propoſed more than adequate. If juſtice meaſures the puniſhment and the offence, liberality diſtributes rewards; "the eye hath not ſeen, nor the ear heard, nor has it entered the heart of man, what God has prepared for thoſe who love him," 1. Cor. II. 9.

To engage the juſt to ſanctify their bodies, as well as their ſouls, they are informed that, if they preſerve

preſerve them pure and unpolluted, they will, after paying the debt of nature, riſe again in glory.

" We know that when he (Jeſus Chriſt) will appear, we ſhall be like him, becauſe we ſhall ſee him as he is," 1. John III. 2.

To deter them from the ſin of uncleanneſs; from all exceſſes, and irregularities, they are told that their bodies are the temples of God, and that God will deſtroy the man, who preſumes to profane his temple, 1. Cor. III. 17.

If many who profeſs Chriſtianity, or rather pretend to profeſs it, be ſubject to vice and irregularities, it is becauſe they diſregard its precepts; of ſuch materials Atheiſts, Deiſts, and Philoſophiſts are moulded; brothels are their ſchools, there they have been taught, and there their lectures are received with applauſe. The Atheiſt does not become a profligate; but the profligate becomes an Atheiſt.

Effects are always proportioned, though not always equal to the efficacy of their cauſes. It is ſimply impoſſible that any effect ſhould ſurpaſs the power of action in its cauſe. This principle admitted, the divinity of the evangelical law is manifeſt in its effects: the means employed for the eſtabliſhment of the law are ſo diſproportioned to the effects produced, that the ſucceſs muſt be aſcribed to the divintity of the law, or, if you will, to the almighty power of its author.

Men are expreſsly choſen for the purpoſe as diſqualified as men could be for ſuch an arduous undertaking: wealth or power they had none; to all human ſcience they were ſtrangers; of the loweſt order of a once powerful, but then degraded nation, they are ſent: upon what errand? To ſuppreſs idolatry, in which the whole world was immerſed, and in the rites and ceremonies of which they

they found the gratification of all their paſſions, and moſt violent inclinations; to aboliſh ſuperſtition interwoven with the laws of all nations, in many, the very baſis of empire; to confound the vanity of all the ſects of Heathen Philoſophers; to repreſs abominations, authoriſed by immemorial cuſtom, countenanced by law, and practiſed, not only with impunity, but with applauſe; to ſubſtitute a law, ſublime in its ſpeculative doctrines, incomprehenſible to human underſtanding, beyond the utmoſt ſtretch of imagination; in its moral precepts ſevere, extending its reſtraints to every faculty of the mind, to every deſire of the ſoul, declaring that to be corrupt and vicious, which was univerſally thought lawful and laudable, and promiſing its diſciples nothing in this world but perſecutions and calamities. To enſure ſucceſs, impediments innumerable, to human power inſurmountable, were to be removed; the laws of nations changed; the attachment of idolaters to their rites and cuſtoms, ſanctioned by the example of their anceſtors, and flattering all their paſſions, to be effaced; difficulties to any power inferior to that, which knows no bounds, irreſiſtible, were to be encountered: the perverſe obſtinacy of the jews; the intrigues of the officers of the heathen temples, who, ſeeing their impending ruin, had recourſe to every artifice, which the ſpirit of darkneſs ſuggeſts; the inſidious arts of politicians, ſupported by the ferocious cruelty of deſpotic power; the ſophiſtical declamations of Heathen philoſphers, in a word, the united powers of all the Spirits of Darkneſs, and their emiſſaries. What would a Plato, who with all his wiſdom and eloquence, could never prevail on a village to adopt his opinions, have thought of ſuch an undertaking? What would a Cicero have done if choſen for ſuch a miſſion? Would he have

have dared to undertake it? No, though conſcious of the vanity of idols, he would not acknowledge it; though convinced of the unity of God, he dared not aſſert it; yet it would have been more meritorious to ſpeak well of truth, than to ſpeak ill of Anthony; death would have been more honorable in defence of truth, than in ſupport of perſonal enmity.

If all the Heathen Philoſophers and Orators had united their efforts to reform the Heathen world, would they have been ſucceſsful? No, becauſe they would have to contend with the moſt powerful intereſts and paſſions of man, and in them there was nothing more than man. They never reformed a village, not even themſelves. This great work was reſerved for the inſtructions of a Fiſherman, and a few aſſociates, deſtitute of human ſcience, and every human aſſiſtance. Theſe we ſee ſurmounting all difficulties, removing all impediments, changing the face of the world, ſoftening the manners of Barbarians, aboliſhing abominable rites and cuſtoms: "theſe who inſcribe their name for this diſcipline, do not contract matrimony with their mothers; nor do the Scythians, to whoſe country the word of Chriſt has reached, eat human fleſh; nor do other barbarous nations inceſtuouſly defile their daughters; nor do men diſregarding the rights of nature abuſe each other; nor do they expoſe to dogs, and birds, as was their cuſtom, the bodies of their relatives and friends; nor do they ſtrangle the old and infirm; nor do they feed on the fleſh of their deareſt friends, as their anceſtors did; nor do they ſacrifice men to their idols, as their inſtitutions preſcribe; nor do they, deceived by a falſe opinion of piety, ſtab their beſt beloved friends—with theſe and many ſuch cuſtoms was life infeſted."—*Euſeb.*

In

" In Parthia, chriſtians though Parthians have not many wives; in Media they do not give the bodies of the dead to the dogs, nor in Perſia, though Perſians, do they eſpouſe their own daughters; nor in Gaul do men contract with men diſregarding the rites of nature; nor in Egypt do they adore a calf, a dog, a buck-goat or a cat; wherever they live they are not overcome by the torment of cuſtom, the wickedneſs of laws, or the turpitude of immoral inſtitutions; nor can they be forced by power, or induced by ſolicitation, to commit any of theſe monſtrous crimes, forbidden by the laws of their maſter," *Bardesane.*

As the powers of human perſuaſion were totally incapable of producing theſe changes, the ſucceſs of the Apoſtles muſt of all neceſſity be aſcribed to the divinity of the law, which they announced. *Lex Domini immaculata convertens animas.* The irreſiſtible power of the Deity, was alone adequate to ſuch an arduous taſk: any power, inferior to omnipotence, would have been inefficient. The man who does not ſee it, is miſerably blind.

For the rapid progreſs of Mahometan impiety, and the extraordinary ſucceſs of other ſectaries, we find a ſufficient cauſe in that violent inclination to ſenſual pleaſures, which is flattered by theſe teachers, their deluded followers vainly imagine that the removal of all reſtraints propoſed by theſe impoſtors is no impediment to future happineſs. To the ſeverity of the Goſpel they have ſubſtituted a ſyſtem of voluptuouſneſs, little, if at all, inferior to that of the famed Epicurus. Mahomet ſurpaſſes him: for this arch impoſtor flatters his followers with a continuation of that voluptuouſneſs, in which Epicurus had placed ſupreme happineſs in this life; he promiſed nothing after death, but annihilation. Quere, to which of theſe claſſes do our modern Sceptics belong? A

A man of ſolid ſenſe, and true ſcience, ſees in the eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity, a miracle of all others the moſt convincing; a ſubſiſting miracle, againſt which all ſuppoſitions are vain; a miracle, which could neither commence, nor be continued, but by almighty power; a miracle, which renders impiety odious, and inexcuſable, and baffles the vain efforts of its abettors.

The ſophiſtical declamation of ſome impoſtors againſt the miracles related in the Goſpel comes next under conſideration, one of the moſt virulent of theſe, who from an intenſe hatred of truth, and refined malignity of heart and ſoul was beſt qualified to be an emiſſary of the ſpirit of darkneſs, the irreconcileable enemy of man, pretends that the miracles related in the Goſpel, though underſtood in the literal ſenſe, do not ſufficiently evince the divinity of Jeſus Chriſt; to this he adds that the miracles related, if underſtood in the literal ſenſe, involve a contradiction, of courſe, as he pretends, they are to be underſtood as allegorical, ſymbolical, or prophetical; finally that when Chriſt referred to miracles, he did not ſpeak of things, which he had done in the fleſh, but of things which he was to do in the ſpirit. Our modern Sceptics have borrowed their ideas from this Sophiſt, as he did from Julian, the apoſtate, and Celſus, the Heathen philoſopher, to whom he was as far ſuperior in malice, as he was inferior in ſcience.

To what has been ſaid on the ſubject of miracles already, the writer only adds, that every event out of the ordinary courſe of things may be conſidered in ſome ſenſe miraculous: it is truly ſo, or apparently ſo; relatively miraculous, or abſolutely ſo: the production of any ſubſtance immediately, which did not exiſt before, either in itſelf, or in its ſubject,

is abſolutely miraculous, ſuch a production is the immediate effect of omnipotence. The inſtantaneous converſion of one ſubſtance into another, the ſenſible qualities of which are both different and diſſimilar, may or may not ſurpaſs the power of created agents; it manifeſtly ſurpaſſes the power of any viſible agent known to us: whether it be abſolutely or relatively miraculous is uſeleſs to enquire, and impoſſible to determine: for if all matter be homogenous in its elementary parts, and ſpecific difference be the reſult of the relative poſition of theſe parts, ſuch a change does not ſeem to ſurpaſs the power of created agents; if on the contrary the elementary parts of matter be ſpecifically different, and independent on relative poſition, the converſion of one ſubſtance into another is beyond the limits of created power: becauſe it is not within the courſe of the eſtabliſhed order, which no created Being is allowed to tranſgreſs.

To communicate life to a body, in which it has been totally extinguiſhed, is an abſolute miracle. The truth of this obſervation is manifeſt from this ſimple conſideration, that in the fœtus there is a diſpoſition, an immediate tendency to life, it is of courſe enlivened in due time, according to the order eſtabliſhed by the Creator; but the extinction of life introduces a contrary diſpoſition, a tendency to corruption. To reſtore life by any created agent would require the eſtabliſhment of a new order directly contrary to that, which the Creator himſelf has eſtabliſhed, which is manifeſtly impoſſible.

The healing of a diſeaſe, though incurable by any means or remedies known to man, does not ſeem to ſurpaſs the power of created agents: whilſt life ſubſiſts, the ſprings on which it depends, however weakened, may be reinſtated by ſome powerful,

agent, removing obſtacles, and applying remedies to us unknown.

The inſtantaneous reſtoration of perfect health, without the application of any remedy, in the caſe of a long and lingering diſeaſe, though curable in due courſe of time, and by ordinary means, may be claſſed with the former, and is relatively miraculous.

It is an invariable rule that the powers of created agents are great in proportion to the excellence of their nature, but never of ſuch extent as to ſubvert the order eſtabliſhed by the Creator; the ſuppoſition is ridiculous: becauſe their powers of action, however great, cannot equal his, who gave them; they muſt therefore be ſubject to the controul of the laws eſtabliſhed by him. As the ſpiritual or intellectual world is eſſentially different from the material world which we inhabit, the laws to which they are ſubject muſt be different, many laws, on which the ſymmetry, harmony, and beauty, of this viſible world depends we know by experience; thus we know the laws of motion, others we conjecture from analogy, the moſt eſſential eſcape our obſervation.

Spirit and matter formed into one principle of action by a ſubſtantial union, is the link in the chain of Beings, which unites the intellectual and material world; man is therefore in part ſubject to the laws of both, not ſtrictly, and excluſively to the laws of either: thus, though the human body be affected by the laws of motion, it is not ſo ſtrictly ſo, as the inanimate ſtone; for being not merely the paſſive inſtrument of the ſoul, but an eſſential part of the man, the principle of action, it partakes in ſome meaſure of his locomotive powers, of this the inanimate ſtone is incapable; in like manner the human ſoul not being a complete ſpirit, and independent agent,

agent, but the ſubſtantial form, which animates matter, and informs the human body, it muſt depend on the body in many of its operations: it is therefore in ſome meaſure ſubject to the laws of motion, which govern this viſible world.

What are the laws, which govern the intellectual world we do not know; what are the powers of action in ſpirits, in themſelves complete and independent agents. we are left to conjecture. From analogy we conclude that they poſſeſs locomotive power, becauſe we poſſeſs this power from the inherent activity of our ſoul, a quality of which matter is deſtitute, and which to matter is incommunicable; this power is great in proportion to the ſuperior excellence of their nature, but circumſcribed by the eſtabliſhed order, which they are not allowed to deſtroy.

How a ſpirit acts on matter we do not know; or how impreſſions are made on ſpirits by material objects we are yet to diſcover; that both is common we know, but the manner is, and in all appearance ever will be, an inpenetrable ſecret.

From experience we know the mutual actions of all bodies: it is in a certain ratio, in certain diſtances invariably the ſame. This is the reſult of laws, depending ſolely on the will of the Creator, ſo conſtant in their operation, that they are ſubject to mathematical preciſion; if we may judge by analogy, the actions of ſpirits on material objects, and the impreſſions made on ſpirits by ſuch objects, or on one ſpirit by another, muſt be the reſult of laws eſtabliſhed for the government of the intellectual world.

One created ſpirit having from its nature no authority over another in the intellectual world, the impreſſions, which it makes, or any authority which it

it exerciſes, muſt depend ſolely on the will of the Creator, and on the rules eſtabliſhed by him for the government of pure intelligences; the intervention of ſenſible objects is therefore totally unneceſſary. Matter ſo far from aſſiſting an intelligence in its operations, would only impede. Whether ſuch intervention be neceſſary to enable a diſengaged ſpirit to make impreſſions on the human mind, whilſt informing the body, or not, is uncertain, the writer thinks ſuch intervention total uſeleſs: for ſince many operations of the mind are independent on the ſenſes, no reaſon can be aſſigned, why a diſengaged ſpirit, acting according to the laws eſtabliſhed for the intellectual world, ſhould not make impreſſions on the mind, whilſt informing the body, as when diſengaged, the mind whether informing the body, or diſengaged, being the ſame in all its eſſential properties. Hence, when it is ſaid in the ſcriptures, that angels have appeared to men, ſpoken to them, &c. the aſſumption of bodies compoſed of air, or any other material ſubſtance, ſeems totally unneceſſary, as they might, without deviating from eſtabliſhed rules, make the ſame impreſſions on the minds of the perſons, to whom they appeared, without the intervention of any ſenſible object.

That the powers of action inherent in diſengaged ſpirits, whether of light or darkneſs, are far ſuperior to ours is clear from the foregoing obſervations; that therefore they may produce effects in appearance miraculous muſt be admitted; but theſe effects, however great, muſt be under the controul of the general order eſtabliſhed by the Creator, which they cannot ſubvert. Thus, for example, to raiſe a tempeſt confined to a certain ſpace, by cauſing an unuſual commotion in a certain portion of air, may, and in all appearance is, within the power of an Angel

of

of Light or Darkneſs; but to ſtop the motion of the moon, the ebbing or flowing of the ſea, is not within the reach of either: it is beyond the limits of created power, becauſe it is a general order, which no created power can deſtroy.

Whatever powers Angels of Light, or Spirits of Darkneſs, may poſſeſs, they cannot exerciſe them to the deſtruction of God's Works without his permiſſion; let their powers of deſtruction be ever ſo great, they cannot deſtroy a fly without his permiſſion: for, being all ſecondary cauſes, they muſt depend on God, the primary cauſe, in all their actions. Hence it follows, that they can produce no extraordinary effects, ſurpaſſing the power of viſible agents, in ſupport of error not diſcoverable by reaſon, becauſe ſuch effects would unavoidably ſeduce men from truth, which perfects the mind, and lead to criminal errors which corrupt it—It would be the deſtruction of God's greateſt work in this viſible world.

That in the times of heathen ſuperſtition, the Spirits of Darkneſs, did effect ſome things ſurpaſſing the power of viſible agents, is extremely probable: but the error, which theſe extrordinary events were intended to authoriſe, that is, idolatry, was in itſelf ſo abſurd, ſo oppoſite to the light of reaſon, that none could be deceived who conſulted reaſon. The permiſſion of ſuch events was one of theſe dreadful judgments which God, in his juſtice, exerciſes on thoſe who make their reaſon ſubſervient to their paſſions. Where the error is not ſenſible, or not ſo manifeſt that reaſon may without difficulty detect it, ſuch events are not permitted: they are inconſiſtent with the general order of Providence, which will not permit God's creatures to be unavoidably ſeduced, and his works corrupted.

Of falſe teachers, ſince the eſtabliſhment of chriſtianity.

anity, few have appealed to ſupernatural effects to warrant their miſſion; they who did were miſerably diſappointed: ſome arch impoſtors, who, to countenance their errors, did pretend to ſupernatural powers, were detected; they had prevailed on ſome deluded wretches to feign themſelves dead, when they pretended to raiſe them they were found in reality lifeleſs. The relatives of theſe wretches publiſhed the cheat.

It has been already obſerved that miracles, as all other facts, are known, not by metaphyſical diſquiſition, but by the teſtimony of their ſenſes to the immediate witneſſes, to us, at a diſtance from the times, and ſcenes of action, by the teſtimony of the witneſſes authentically tranſmitted. Thus we know that Cæſar was murdered, with as unerring certainty as the men who aſſiſted at that tragical ſcene; the conviction of the truth is as ſtrong on our minds, but the impreſſion of horror is diminiſhed.

Facts, which are not uncommon, are believed without diſcuſſion; if they be not intereſting, the diſcuſſion is minute in proportion as facts are intereſting, yet whilſt they remain in the ordinary courſe of events, there muſt be ſtrong prejudices againſt a witneſs to ruin his credit. Extraordinary facts are not admiſſible, nor are they ever univerſally believed, without ſtrict enquiry; the leaſt prejudice againſt a witneſs, will invalidate his teſtimony, hence we may conclude that facts extremely intereſting, which ſurpaſs the power of viſible agents, cannot poſſibly obtain credit if the witneſſes, who atteſt them, be not found upon ſtrict inveſtigation, free from ſuſpicion, of ſurpriſe, fraud or deſign.

Man is by nature ſo conſtituted that he eaſily believes

lieves what flatters his paſſions, if it be not out of the ordinary courſe of things, if ſo, however flattering the event may appear, a wiſe man muſt ſuſpend his opinion, until after diſcuſſion; but man is inacceſſible to a truth, which mortifies him, if not forced by inconteſtible evidence to admit it. As miracles in general have been offered in proof of truths mortifying to human nature, contradicting man's moſt violent inclinations, captivating his underſtanding, and curbing his imagination, it would have been more than a miracle if they had obtained credit without diſcuſſion, or if, upon the moſt exact and critical diſcuſſion they had not been ſupported by irreſiſtible evidence: hence St. Auſtin ſays: the man, who does not believe theſe prodigies to have been effected, which the world believes, is himſelf a prodigy.

To found an aſſent in prudence it is neceſſary to be well aſſured that the witneſſes of miraculous events were not deceived, nor diſpoſed to deceive; if to theſe conditions a third be added, that is, that any attempt to deceive would have been fruitleſs, the teſtimony is unexceptionable: it impreſſes conviction on the mind; to refuſe an aſſent is the effect of perverſe obſtinacy.

Theſe principles pre-ſuppoſed, let us proceed to examine the miracles of Jeſus Chriſt. As man he was the moſt humble, meek, humane and innocent, of Adam's race; his life ſo free from blemiſh, or even ſuſpicion, that he ſubmitted it to the criticiſm of his enemies; "which of you," ſaid he, John iv. 46, "will charge me with ſin?" that the traitor who ſold him, acknowledged his innocence "I have ſinned, betraying innocent blood," Matt. xxvii. 4; the charges brought before Pilate by his moſt malignant enemies were ſo manifeſtly calumnious, that, from them, without hearing a word in his defence, Pilate was convinced

convinced of his innocence: "I find in him no cauſe," John xviii, 38; and when forced by the clamors of the Jews to conſent to his death, he waſhed his hands ſaying: "I am innocent of the blood of this juſt man," Matt xxvii, 24. The ſanctity of his doctrine was perfectly correſpondent with the ſanctity of his life, a ſketch of his morality has been given, and, contraſted with that of the heathen philoſophers; he ſhewed the folly and impiety of idolatry; the neceſſity of honoring one God, Creator of all things; the boundleſs ſubmiſſion due to his orders in the moſt trying circumſtances. Impoſtors do not ſacrifice their lives to enforce obedience to the law of God, their lives were never remarkable for ſanctity; the blaſpheming Scioliſt, who pretends that Jeſus Chriſt was an impoſtor, ought to aſſign ſome private intereſt, which he had in view. Impoſtors, who have no other object in view but the glory of God, and the welfare of man; who ſacrifice themſelves to the happineſs of others, are of ſuch an uncommon character, that they are to be ſought for in the wild imagination of modern ſcribblers—there are no ſuch phenomena in nature.

To paſs unnoticed the miracles attending his birth, by which his miſſion was announced, let us examine minutely ſome of the many, which he wrought to atteſt the truth of his doctrine, the firſt we find upon record is the converſion of water into wine at Cana in Galilee, John II. The witneſſes were numerous, the diſciples were preſent: "he manifeſted his glory, and his diſciples believed in him," v. 2. The diſciples were not philoſophers, no, nor were the waiters who drew the waters, and filled the ſix ſtone pots, each containing two or three *metretas*, or meaſures; but the moſt illiterate peaſant knows the difference between wine and water, as well as the moſt

moſt acute philoſopher. The water might have been removed and wine ſubſtituted by ſome artifice. Yes, if there had been but an ounce or two, or even a few pounds, by ſome ſtratagem might have been removed; but the impoſſibility of deception in ſo great a quantity is manifeſt: the Greek *metreta* and the Hebrew *batus* was a meaſure of a cubic foot; a cubic foot of water weighs ſixty two pounds and half avoirdupoiſe, or $76\frac{5}{7}$ Troy weight, the philoſopher may conſult any writer on hydroſtatics, the unlearned may believe it on the credit of the author. Hence confining each pot, to two *metretas*, or meaſures, the quantity of water converted into wine was nine hundred and ſeventeen pounds, Troy. The inſtantaneous removal of ſuch a quantity unknown to, or unobſerved by ſpectators, is not within the reach of ſtratagem or artifice.

A chemical preparation might give the appearance of wine to a ſmall quantity of water, and impoſe on the ſimplicity of perſons unaccuſtomed to wine; but a chemical preparation to convert two hogſheads of water inſtantaneouſly into wine, unobſerved by the ſpectators, muſt be extracted from the feculence of a modern ſceptic's brain. As the wine was not conſumed, nor intended to be conſumed, immediately, in a company where there was a preſident of the ſacerdotal order to prevent the effects of intemperance, as was the cuſtom of the Jews upon ſuch occaſions, the deception, if any had been, muſt have been detected.

To remove every ſuſpicion of fraud, the waiters were ordered to draw the water, to fill the ſtone pots, which being intended for the Jewiſh purifications, were always to be filled with pure elementary water; from this water untouched by Jeſus Chriſt to preſent to the preſident of the company, who, from his

office, must have been perfectly sober, he declared it wine of a superior quality.

The fact was publicly asserted by some of the witnesses whilst they were all, or at least a great majority of them living, and not contradicted by avowed enemies, no fact was ever authentic if this be not. Let us pass to another equally authentic, and not less surpassing the power of man, Matt. xiv. We read that with five loaves and two fishes 5000 men besides women and children were fed, and that twelve baskets were filled with the fragments, which remained. Here there was no room for deception, or collusion: 5000 men were not taught to believe that they had dined, and dismissed with hungry bellies, words do not satisfy hunger: something more substantial than sound is necessary to appease its cravings. Why were such numbers collected? because they had already seen the most unheard of prodigies. "And Jesus, answering, said to them, (John's disciples) go and relate to John what you have heard and seen, the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise again." Matt. xi. 4—5. St. Luke adds: "at that hour he relieved many from diseases, and infirmities, and gave sight to many, who were blind:" vii. 21. He had already raised to life the widow of Naim's son, of which miracle the whole country was informed: Luke vii. 15. These miracles were public; John's disciples had seen them, or he would not have ordered them to relate what they saw, it would have been a most ridiculous injunction. It is not matter of surprise that some thousands were collected; but it is a melancholy reflection that the inveterate and incurable envy of the Pharisees prevented greater numbers from attending to the instructions of such a teacher; they, who did, were not disappointed: "and he, coming forth,

saw

ſaw a great multitude, and had compaſſion on them, and healed their ſick," Matt. xiv. 14; "And there came to him great multitudes, having with them the dumb, the blind, the lame, and many others, and they caſt them at his feet, and he healed them," Matt. XV, 30; "ſo that the multitudes wondered ſeeing the dumb ſpeak, the lame walk, and the blind ſee, and they glorified the God of Iſrael," *ibid.* Of theſe multitudes many attended for inſtruction; ſome in gratitude for paſt relief from infirmities; others in hopes of preſent; of the Phariſees, and their adherents, ſome attracted by ſimple, perhaps faultleſs, curioſity, others to ſcrutinize, and detect, if poſſible, ſome word or action, on which to found an accuſation, and diminiſh the credit of a man, who unmaſked their hypocriſy, of this laſt claſs it does not appear that many were in the deſert.

But why withdraw into this deſert place? Herod had juſt put John to death, and, hearing the report of Chriſt's miracles, was deſirous of ſeeing him, Luke IX. 9. Chriſt did not think proper at that time to expoſe himſelf to the fury of that tyrant, moreover the place was not far diſtant from a populous country, in which there was no ſcarcity of proviſions. Hence St. Luke ſays, IX. 12, "the day began to decline, and the Twelve came, and ſaid to him: diſmiſs the crouds that, going into the towns and villages about, they may lodge and find proviſions."

But why remain three whole days without proviſions? It is not ſaid that they were without proviſions, but that they were three days attending to Chriſt's inſtructions: the quantity, which they brought, appears to have been conſumed before the evening of the third day, and as they delayed until perhaps it might have been inconvenient to ſome, and impoſſible to others, to find proviſions, that night in the adjacent

djacent towns and villages, had they been dismiſſed without food, ſome of them would have fainted on the way. But why remain until evening? Chriſt's will, to which all his creatures are obedient, was a ſufficient reaſon, the attractive powers of his divine preſence, and his heavenly voice, eaſily detained them.

In this miracle, the authenticity of which is unexceptionable, the almighty power of God is manifeſt. It does not appear that the loaves were increaſed by any additional matter, whether immediately created, or pre-exiſting in ſome other form, and ſuper-added: St. John ſays, expreſsly, that the twelve baſkets of fragments, which remained were of the barley loaves, (vi) of theſe, not of any additional matter, the men muſt have eaten, and, as they were ranged in companies of fifties and hundreds, (Mark vi) theſe five loaves muſt have been preſent, and eaten at the ſame time by theſe different companies, leſs than five loaves, was not ſufficient for a company of fifty, they muſt alſo have been preſent in the baſkets, after the company had dined. This obſervation may ſerve as a corrective to the wild declamation of ſome new fangled teachers, who, though believing the power of God to be infinite, pretend to confine it by their own imagination, as if infinite power cannot produce an effect beyond the range of limited imagination.

Of theſe raiſed from the dead, three are particularly mentioned by the Evangeliſts, perhaps they were of greater note, or the facts, from their nature, were leſs liable to objection. The widow of Naim's ſon, Luke VII. 15; the daughter of Jair, prince of the ſynagogue, Matt. IX, Mark VI, Luke VIII; and Lazarus, John XI. Modern Seeptics, in imitation of their anceſtors, the Heathen philoſophers, under the influence of the ſame ſpirit of darkneſs, "who is

King

King over all the ſons of pride," Job XLI. 25; "at whoſe will they are held captives," 2d Tim. II. 26; "by whoſe envy death entered into the world, and whom all theſe imitate, who are of his party," Wiſdom II. 25, have exhauſted invention to throw ſome obſcurity on theſe miracles; their efforts have only ſerved to elucidate them.

The firſt is thus related by St. Luke: "as he approached the gate of the city a dead man was carried out, an only ſon to his mother, and ſhe a widow, a great multitude from the city with her; whom when the Lord ſaw he was moved with compaſſion for her; and ſaid to her do not weep; and coming up he touched the coffin, (theſe who carried it ſtood) and ſaid young man, I ſay to thee, ariſe; and he who had been dead ſat up, and began to ſpeak, and he gave him to his mother: fear ſeized them all, and they magnified God," Luke VII.

There might have been a colluſion, ſays the Sceptic, between Chriſt and the Widow, it is ſaid that a drowning man will catch at a ruſh, deſpair ſuggeſts ſubterfuges, which carry improbability and ſometimes impoſſibility, on their face, ſuch is the preſent: it does not appear that Chriſt's poſſeſſions in Judea were great, or that he made any valuable acquiſitions for the aggrandizement of himſelf or family. The pretended colluſion would require no trifling ſum: to purchaſe the perpetual ſilence of a woman of ſome note, of her ſon, of all perſons concerned in a public funeral, was not eaſy, to paſs unnoticed the impoſſibility of impoſing on his diſciples, of whom we ſhall ſpeak hereafter.

To this firſt ſubterfuge the Sceptic adds a ſecond: perhaps, ſays he, the young man was in a lethargic fit. Why not inform us by what extraordinary combination

combination of events Chriſt arrived at the very inſtant of his recovery? What amazing ſagacity he muſt have had to diſcover that this young man, whom he had not ſeen, and who was thought dead by thoſe, who ſaw him, was but in a lethargic fit, and that he would awake preciſely at that inſtant of time, and in that place? What penetration of mind does our Sceptic diſplay in his different ſuppoſitions?

His laſt ſubterfuge yet remains to be examined: St. Luke is the only Evangeliſt who relates this fact, and he was not preſent at it. True, but he is not the only one who believed it. The fact was never denied by the Jews, nor contradicted; if we may judge by his writings, St. Luke was not a man open to ſeduction; he muſt have had the fact from unqueſtionable authority, or he would not have related it: Men of ſenſe are not impoſtors without private views.

The Evangeliſts did not write a hiſtory of Chriſt's miracles: their object was to ſhew that he was the Meſſias, promiſed and expected by the Jews, and to engage both them, and the Gentiles, to believe in him, and obſerve the maxims of his divine law, to evince the truth of his miſſion, and the indiſpenſable neceſſity of obedience to his precepts: they ſpoke in general of his miracles, ſpecifying ſome, which to them, and to us alſo, appeared unexceptionable, in this we admire their wiſdom: Why ſo? becauſe any one miraculous effect, beyond the reach of created power, is ſufficient to authenticate his miſſion, and all the other miracles, which he wrought; as it was impoſſible that God, by an immediate interference, ſhould authorize deception, or permit any deception in his name, without affording ſufficient means to detect it.

But why did not all the Evangeliſts relate the ſame miracles?

miracles? They did: for they say in general that he healed the sick, the lame and blind; that he raised the dead, and cast out evil spirits. They did not always specify the same miracles because they did not consult each the other, nor act in concert having no imposture in view, hence each of the Evangelists insisted more particularly on what he thought sufficient for his purpose. Three of the Evangelists relate the resurrection of Jair's daughter: their simple narration leaves no room for suspicion: Christ on his return from the country of the Gerasani, who were displeased for the loss of their hogs, was met by the Prince of the Synagogue, a man of great note in the country, he tells Christ that his daughter was dying, and, prostrate at his feet, he prayed him to come and heal her, on the way a messenger arrived, who informed them that the girl was dead. Christ tells the disconsolate father not to fear, and continues his journey; at their arrival they found a tumult, tears and lamentations, some musical instruments playing, as was customary with the Jews; Christ orders them all out, saying, the child is not dead but sleeps, thereby signifying that it was as easy for him to raise her from death, as to awake her from sleep: he then takes with him the girl's parents, and three of his disciples, as witnesses, whilst the croud derided him for attempting to awake a girl from death, which they thought impossible; he then takes the girl by the hand, and ordered her to rise, which she did immediately; the sarcastical derision of the multitude only served to silence obloquy, and remove the most distant suspicion, or even colour of deception. This simple narration sets the powers of invention at defiance: there could have been no collusion with the prince, and his whole family. An impostor, on the news of her death, would have interrupted his journey;

ney; he would not dare to promiſe relief, which he muſt know was not within his power; he could not preſume that the girl was in a trance, and would recover at the very inſtant that he ordered, not before, all theſe circumſtances leave no room for cavilling.

To ſet the vanity of our modern Sceptics in a clear light, the conjectures, on which they pretend to invalidate the truth of miracles, which have ſtood the teſt of ages, and obtained the ſuffrage of all poliſhed nations, are here inſerted:

They are, ſay they, related in ſuch order as gives room for ſuſpicion. The reſurrection of Lazarus, the greateſt of Chriſt's miracles, is omitted by Matthew, Mark, and Luke; related by John, who wrote his goſpel at an advanced age, when the witneſſes were dead, he might then have invented this fact in honor of his maſter. It is not probable that the other three would have omitted it if the fact had not been ſuppoſed. The widow of Naim might have agreed with Chriſt, and her ſon might have feigned himſelf dead, or he might have been in a lethargy, and rouſed at that critical inſtant; Jair's daughter might have been ſubject to vapours; Chriſt himſelf ſaid that ſhe ſlept; as he directed them to conceal the miracle, he did not think it unexceptionable; the circumſtances of Lazarus's reſurrection render the miracle doubtful: Chriſt is ſaid to have wept, to have called with a loud voice; and Lazarus to have riſen, his face covered with a towel, theſe circumſtances found a ſuſpicion of impoſture, and the preſumption is encreaſed by the fury of the Jews, who reſolved to put both Chriſt and Lazarus to death.

If to eſtabliſh facts, or to efface pre-conceived opinions, the Evangeliſts had offered ſuſpicions and ſurmiſes,

ſurmiſes, they would have been objects of univerſal deriſion: wild conjectures either for, or againſt hiſtory, are treated with contempt. The ſuſpicions againſt the reſurrection of the widow's ſon, and Jair's daughter, have been already diſcuſſed; the injunction of ſilence is an indirect cenſure on vanity; if the three Evangeliſts do not make ſpecial mention of the reſurrection of Lazarus, it is not the only fact, which they paſs unnoticed, it was not neceſſary to their purpoſe. They had aſſigned other miracles authentic, ſufficient and equally effectual to eſtabliſh the truth of Chriſt's miſſion: the reſurrection of a dead body, whether four months or four minutes lifeleſs, is beyond the range of limited power; the feeding of four or five thouſand people with a few loaves of bread is not leſs ſo. If the three Evangeliſts had denied the fact, their denial would have been ſufficient to invalidate St. John's relation; their ſilence is totally immaterial: the ſilence of ten witneſſes on a fact, of which they do not ſpeak at all, does not affect the teſtimony of one, who aſſerts it.

It is true John was old when he wrote his Goſpel, his authority muſt have been indiſputable to obtain credit; it is not poſſible that any man relating miraculous events of public notoriety, within the memory of man, of which the world had not heard before, ſhould obtain credit on his bare aſſertion. If Lazarus was not living when John wrote his Goſpel, of the immenſe number of Jews who embraced the chriſtian religion in Jeruſalem, Judea and elſewhere, ſome hundreds were yet living, who knew the fact, either on the teſtimony of their own ſenſes, or from the relation of ocular witneſſes.

The circumſtances, which in our ſophiſt's opinion found a ſuſpicion, are calculated on principles of

common ſenſe to remove every ſuſpicion : the Saviour aſked the Jews where they had laid him, in order to extort from them an acknowledgement of his death, and that he had lain four days in the grave ; he ordered them to remove the ſtone that they might ſee the corpſe, which they had interred ; he called aloud that they might be witneſſes of the power, which he exerciſed over death ; Lazarus came forth bound as he was buried, Chriſt ordered them to looſe him, to convince them it was not a phantom, but the very man, whom they had depoſited in the grave.

As St. John had written his Goſpel expreſsly to demonſtrate the divinity of Jeſus Chriſt againſt the errors of Ebion, Cerinthus and others, it was natural for them to inſiſt more particularly on theſe miracles, in which, the independent and almighty power of Chriſt was moſt viſible. In his relation of the reſurrection of Lazarus the true character of Chriſt is manifeſt, that is, the unity of his perſon in the divine and human nature : he wept, which is a function peculiar to man ; he groaned in ſpirit, indignant at the cruelty of the demon, by whoſe envy ſin, and death the wages of ſin, had entered the world ; the deſtruction of theſe enemies was the great end of his miſſion. He lifted up his eyes to the father, that they might ſee it was in the name of the true God he taught ; by his own almighty power he ordered the dead man to riſe, and was inſtantly obeyed, ſhewing that he himſelf was God, one with the father, as he had ſaid, and exerciſing the ſame power ; in all this there could have been no deception, nor could God permit a deception in his name, which was inacceſſible to detection.

In like manner all the circumſtances of the cure of the blind man, John IX, ſhew him to have been the Creator, he made clay with his ſpittle, put it on the blind

blind man's eyes, thus forming the moſt delicate organ of the human frame of the ſame matter, of which he had originally formed the whole body. Conſidered as a medical application, clay is better calculated to deſtroy ſight, than to produce it. He ſent the man through the city, to the pool of Siloe, at the foot of Mount Sion, that the citizens might be witneſſes of the power, which he exerciſed, abſent as well as preſent ; after he had waſhed in the pool his eyes were opened, or, to ſpeak more correctly, the organs of ſight were then formed. The man's return with his eyes open, entire, and perfect, ſurpriſed all thoſe, who knew him from his birth, and who ſaw him go blind to the pool ; the Phariſees alarmed, interrogate him in the moſt artful manner, to obtain ſomething from his anſwers to veil a truth deſtructive of their own authority; their malice only ſerved to remove every exception; in deſpair they have recourſe to the circumſtance of the ſabbath, pretending that making clay with the ſpittle, and putting it on the eyes, was a violation of the ſabbath. However ridiculous the pretence it had the deſired effect on ſome ; but the reſurrection of Lazarus was open to no pretence ; hence they reſolved to murder him, and Jeſus Chriſt alſo, thinking that, the only effectual means of removing a cenſor of ſuch authority. At his entrance into Jeruſalem, hearing the croud atteſt that he had called Lazarus from the tomb, all efforts, ſay they, are vain : " the whole world follows him," John IX. 19. In the Council which they aſſembled, the only accuſation brought againſt him was, that he wrought miracles, and if they permitted him to continue, that all would believe in him, John XI. 47. But if theſe miracles were not ſuppoſed, why did not the prieſts and Phariſees, who were beſt qualified

to

to examine ſuch facts, believe in them? Some did, many did not; ſome who did, dared not avow it, for which the Evangeliſt aſſigns a very ſimple reaſon, "many of the princes believed in him, but, becauſe of the Phariſees, they did not confeſs, leaſt they ſhould be expelled the ſynagogue, they loved the glory of men, more than the glory of God," John XII. 42—43.

The ſeeming regularity of the Phariſees, that appearance of ſanctity, which they aſſumed, gave them an aſcendant over the minds of the people, who believed them ſuch as they appeared; this aſcendant was to them a ſource of wealth and power; it fed their ambition, and their avarice, theſe two great ſprings of action. Chriſt was in their mind a moſt importunate rival, his doctrine deſtructive of their aſcendancy, cancelling at once their honors and intereſts: he unmaſked their hypocriſy, undeceived the people, ruined their credit; they of courſe conſidered him as their capital enemy, and to prevent their own ruin, reſolved on his. As the ſame cauſes, acting in ſimilar circumſtances, invariably produce the ſame effects, we find an oppoſition made to the Goſpel, in all ages, on the very principles, on which the oppoſition of the Phariſees to Chriſt himſelf was founded. Thus when Paul preaches againſt idolatry in Epheſus, Demetrius the ſilver-ſmith, who employed many workmen in the fabrication of ſmall ſilver temples, like the great temple of Diana, ſaid to them: "you ſee, and hear, that, not only at Epheſus, but all over Aſia, this Paul perſuades, and averts, a great multitude ſaying they are not Gods, which are made by hands, ... the temples of the great Diana will be thought nothing of," Acts XIX. 26. To enflame their zeal for the honor of the goddeſs, he had prefaced

faced his diſcourſe by ſaying, " you know that our gain is by this trade." v. 25.

From authentic hiſtory we know the arts, which were practiſed by the miniſters of the heathen temples to ſupport the credit of their Idols, and preſerve them from that deſtruction, which the chriſtian ſyſtem threatened; the pretended reſponſes of their oracles deſiring the extermination of chriſtians as enemies not only to the Gods, but to their Kings. Was it pure zeal for the glory of their idols? No. Theſe impoſtors could not be ignorant of the vanity of their Idols, and of the falſehood of the reſponſes, which they themſelves, had forged, but they maſked their private views under the cloak of zeal for the honor of their Idols, the ſame is true of all the different leaders of factions amongſt chriſtians: not one of theſe new teachers, who had not the gratification of ſome favourite paſſion in view, the pretended diſcovery of ſome abuſe was a maſk to conceal the real motive of the revolt. The ſimple were deluded with the idea of reform, the more clear ſighted ſaw a field open to ambition, a removal of reſtraints was a ſtrong allurement to the ſenſual; novelty an inducement to many. A party is ſoon formed; to encreaſe the party, recourſe is had to artifice: the paſſions of the great are flattered; miſrepreſentation of the tenets of the primitive ſyſtem induſtriouſly circulated, the indiſcretion of any of its miniſters maliciouſly exaggerated; the crimes, whether real or pretended, of individuals, aſcribed to the whole body, the moſt calumnious invectives publiſhed with effrontery, every art practiſed that imagination can ſuggeſt to efface the light of truth, and excite an averſion to the abjured communion. The miniſters of the new order, in ſelf defence, muſt endeavour to continue the deception. They

inceſſantly

inceſſantly repeat the ſame calumnious miſrepreſentations, and, though a thouſand times refuted by authentic documents, they continue to amuſe their deluded followers by the ſame idle tales, The oppoſition of the Phariſees continues to the preſent day in their ſucceſſors, the ſons of pride; our modern Sophiſts are more inexcuſable, for they have had more unequivocal proof of the divinity of Chriſt, than the Phariſees had: all the miracles, which the Phariſees ſaw, are yet viſible in their effect, the deſtruction of idolatry, and the converſion of the world, as was foretold. This effect, of which our Sophiſts are witneſſes, againſt their will, the Phariſees did not ſee, their obſtinacy, therefore, however criminal, was not ſo inexcuſable, nor will its puniſhment be ſo great.

In the incredulity of the Jews our Sophiſts pretend to diſcover another cauſe of ſuſpicion: if, ſay they, the miracles, which are ſaid to be effected at the birth of Chriſt be combined with theſe which he is ſaid to have wrought in his life time, the Jews muſt have believed in him. Could we, ſays a Jew, who have told the world that one would come from God to puniſh the wicked, treat him ignominouſly when he came? To the Jew the writer replies as he does to his brother the Deiſt, that the queſtion argues a fund of ſtupidity: the magiſtrate, who ſacrifices juſtice to his private views; the woman who dupes and diſhonors her huſband; the highway-man who robs, the aſſaſſin, who murders for hire, diſregard truth, juſtice and all the reſtraints of reaſon and religion; ſo did the Jews; the miſcreants, who brought Chriſt before Pilate, wrapped up in ſelf-created importance, thought their appearance ſufficient to convict him of their calumnious charges; their confidence was great in proportion to the injuſtice

of

of their cauſe: "if this man were not a malefactor would we have delivered him up to thee?" John xviii.

The appearance of the Angel to a few ſhepherds, men of little note, made no impreſſion on the public at large; the arrival of the wiſe men was public and threw the whole city into confuſion; they ſaid that they were come to adore him, who was born King of the Jews. It was thought that this young prince was cut off by Herod in the general maſſacre of the children; few if any knew his eſcape into Egypt: Joſeph and Mary were ſtrangers in Bethleham and had retired in ſilence before the maſſacre, on their return from Egypt they lived in a different part of the country in great obſcurity. Chriſt was thought ſon to a mechanic, by none ſuſpected to be that King, whom the wiſe men came to adore.—Thirty years were more than ſufficient to efface the remembrance of theſe events when nothing occurred to refreſh it. The diſappointment of the Jews at ſeeing a Meſſias, whom they expected to reinſtate their monarchy in Solomon's glory, and make them maſters of the world, preaching poverty and humility without a place to repoſe his wearied limbs, embittered their minds and indiſpoſed them againſt himſelf and his miracles, if he were to come again with the ſame appearance of poverty and humility, teaching the ſame doctrine, working the ſame miracles, he would meet the ſame oppoſition.

Paſſages are cited, mutilated, unconnected with antecedents and conſequents, which determine the ſenſe, ſome diſtorted from the intended ſignification, and others totally ſuppoſed, in order to miſlead the uninformed, and induce them to believe that early writers, Origen, Eucher, Ambroſe, Hilary, Irenæus, Jerome and others, did not think the miracles of Chriſt

Chriſt real, or to be underſtood in the literal ſenſe, though from his miracles they unanimouſly demonſtrate his divinity, to enforce this truth citations are uſeleſs. They have written whole books to demonſtrate the truth and reality of Chriſt's miracles; in their different explications, from which paſſages are artfully extracted, they pre-ſuppoſe the hiſtorical truth, from it they deduce different ſignifications: the miracles of Chriſt were inſtructive as was his words; they have their language, if they be underſtood: but this ſilent language, which miracles ſpeak, ſuppoſe, of all neceſſity, the reality of the facts: thus St. Paul ſays that Abraham's two wives, Agar and Sarah, ſignify the old and new teſtament, as Agar was a ſlave, and Sarah a free woman, but if Abraham had not theſe two wives in reality, the one a ſlave and the other a free woman, they could not be figurative of the old and new teſtament. A non-entity is no ſign. In like manner, St. Auſtin ſays, that Jair's daughter raiſed from death, ſignified the Jewiſh people, but if ſhe had not been raiſed there could have been neither ſign nor ſignification.

Some looſe expreſſions of Origen, in a work which abounds with errors, are artfully diſtorted againſt the ſenſe of the author. There are, he ſays, ſome things written, which have not happened, which could not happen. The aſſertion is true: it is written that at the coming of the Meſſias, the wolf, that fierce and ravenous animal, would feed with the lamb; that the panther would ſleep with the kid; that the calf, the bull, and the lion, would paſture together, that the ox and the bear would have their young in the ſame cavern; that the lion would eat ſtraw with the ox. Theſe things have not happened, nor will they happen. In theſe expreſſions, manifeſtly

feſtly figurative is announced the peace of the world at Chriſt's birth, and the converſion of the Heathens from the ſavage cruelty, natural to theſe ferocious animals, to the meekneſs of the lamb.

From an exuberance of imagination, Origen thought he found allegorical ſignifications where they were not; but the hiſtorical truth of miraculous facts recorded in the ſcriptures he never denied; from the hiſtorical truth he deduced his fanciful ſignifications: his works againſt Celſus contain concluſive evidence of the truth of miracles; in them, the teachers of our profeſſed Sceptics have found all their pretended difficulties againſt truth, there alſo they might have found the moſt ſatisfactory ſolution. The writer does not accuſe the modern fry of having recourſe to Origen's Works: to ignorance and diſſipation they are unintelligible.

As the jaundiced eye refers the yellow hue to every object it ſees, ſo impiety aſcribes the confuſion of its own dreams to the truth, which condemns it. Mole hills are mountains; ſhadows are metamorphoſed into ſubſtances, in the delirium of impiety. There is no fact, however authentic, in which it does not find ſome circumſtance to found a ſuſpicion, and the moſt diſtant ſuſpicion is in its idea convincing evidence. The narration of the Evangeliſts is not ſufficiently detailed; if more circumſtantial, our Sceptics would find greater cauſe of ſuſpicion; the perſons raiſed from death, or relieved from diſeaſes, are not exactly deſcribed; the accounts they brought from the other world are not tranſmitted; why were not theſe miracles wrought in favor of men of note in Judea? Why were not their Princes, their Nobles, raiſed from death? Was it not unjuſt, and injurious, to permit the demons to deſtroy the ſwine: an uſurpation of authority to drive the traders out

of the temple; a flagrant injuſtice to overſet the money changer's tables, and ſcatter their money on the floor? Unlawful to take figs from a tree without the owner's permiſſion? Why expect to find them on the tree when it was not the proper ſeaſon? In the transfiguration there was room for impoſture: he retired to a mountain, where the refraction of light, through ſome cloud, might have dazzled his diſciples. He might have artfully engaged the Samaritan Woman to diſcloſe her own ſecrets, and then pretend to have known them by the ſpirit of prophecy. The women, who are ſaid to be cured of different diſeaſes, might have been ſubject to vapours, ſick, in imagination: from which they might have been relieved by the confidence they placed in his aſſurances. To theſe impertinent queſtions, and wild conjectures, which is, in ſubſtance, all that Sceptics find to cenſure, or ſuſpect, the reply is extremely ſimple: the Evangeliſts were not public notaries, nor did they write for Sceptics: they were plain men, who told plain truth in plain language; a circumſtantial hiſtory of Chriſt's miracles, or of the perſons relieved, was foreign to their purpoſe, and entirely uſeleſs: circumſtances of time, place or perſon, are immaterial; a fact, beyond the limits of human power, is at all times, in all places, and with reſpect to all perſons, impoſſible to man. To God neither time, place, perſon, or ſituation, give oppoſition: there is nothing difficult when omnipotence is the agent.

The atteſtation of perſons raiſed from the dead would be ſuſpected, as is their reſurrection; their obſervations, on the other world, might gratify idle curioſity, they could anſwer no other purpoſe. The joys of Heaven, the horrors of Hell, the narrow path, which leads to the former, and the broad way and rapid deſcent, through which all Sceptics roll on to the

the latter, are deſcribed by Chriſt himſelf, who was better informed.

The deſtruction of the ſwine ſeems rather an act of juſtice: ſwine's fleſh was forbidden by the Jewiſh law, the Samaritans furniſhed both the temptation and means to diſobey the precept. From this event we learn ſome important truths: the intenſe malice of the demon, his deſtructive powers; his irreconcileable enmity even to his ſlaves; but we learn alſo that, however great his natural powers of deſtruction may be, he cannot exert them without an immmediate permiſſion.

In the expulſion of the money changers and traders from the temple, there is no room for cenſure. It was the houſe of his father, which they prophaned, he very juſtly expelled them. It is one of theſe inſtances, in which his power, even over the wicked, is conſpicuous: one of their princes, perhaps, would not have done it with impunity; their ready compliance with his injunction, ſubmiſſion to an ignominious chaſtiſement, and ſilence, when publicly charged with injuſtice by an obſcure individual, poſſeſſed of no place, to which political power is annexed, muſt have been the effect of an inviſible power. In the courſe of natural events it is impoſſible. The fig-tree, being on the way, was perhaps for the uſe of the public, if it had an owner, by his abſolute will, he might have diſpoſed of the tree, and its owner. His humanity, united to the divinity, was ſubject to the natural affections of human nature, according to his will. His hunger was then voluntary, a ſtrong indication of his ardent deſire of the fruits of juſtice and ſanctity; his acceſs to the tree at an unſeaſonable time, ſhews that he expects theſe fruits at all times, and his prohibition to bear fruit in future, at which the tree immediately withered, ſhews the

danger

danger of his finding nothing but leaves, that is vain projects, or ineffectual reſolutions. He himſelf ſaid, in the parable of the fig tree, Luke XIII, "It bears no fruit, cut it down."

To ſhew that he was Creator of the different claſſes of Beings, which compoſe the Univerſe, he gave ſignal inſtances of his power over them all: the demons he expelled, the ſick he healed, the dead he raiſed, the ſea and wind obeyed his order. The inſtances of his power, in conferring favors, are numberleſs; of inflicting puniſhments there are but three: the chaſtiſement of the Money Changers, which was extremely moderate, from which we learn, that he puniſhes with regret, and ſparingly, whilſt his favors flow from the fulneſs of his heart, and are without meaſure. The Swine irrational, and the fig tree inanimate, he totally deſtroyed, intimating that his power extended over the whole of the Creation. As common father his cares extended to all his children, without diſtinction or diſcrimination; the poor were more frequently relieved, becauſe they were numerous, and their wants were greater; the rich were not excluded, if they did not exclude themſelves, as too many of them, engaged in purſuits of pleaſure, or ſomething worſe, unfortunately did. If his enemies complained that he was more profuſe of his favors to ſtrangers, than to his fellow citizens, he replied, that in the days of Elias there were many widows in Judea, and that he was ſent to a Sidonian; and that, in the days of Naaman, the Syrian, there were many lepers in Iſrael, and not one of them cleanſed. There is no title to extraordinary graces; where there is no title there is no claim, conſequently no acceptation of perſons, which is a ſin againſt diſtributive juſtice.

To refer the transfiguration of Chriſt to the refraction of light, argues the moſt contemptible ignorance;

ance : refracted light ſhews the object, from which it is emitted, in the direction in which the refracted ray comes to the eye ; thus, from the refraction of its rays, by the atmoſphere, the ſun appears above the horizon, when it is in reality below it, this is called, by Aſtronomers, "*the ſun's apparent riſing ;*" but refracted light will not form articulate ſounds ; it will not ſhew three men ſpeaking aloud and intelligibly, where there is but one ; our aſſent to the truth of the fact reſts on the ſincerity of the witneſſes ; which will be diſcuſſed in the courſe of the work.

Three witneſſes were choſen as neceſſary to atteſt the fact, Moſes from the place of ſouls, and Elias, from the place of his reſt, appeared with him ; the former atteſting his power over the dead, and the latter his ſupreme authority over the living ; both ſhewing that he was not one of the Prophets, as was thought by the Jews ; but the Meſſias, whom the law, of which Moſes was the miniſter, and the Prophets, of whom Elias was the chief, had promiſed. They ſpoke of his departure, which he was to make at Jeruſalem, the term *Exodos*, employed by St. Luke, may ſignify, indifferently, his departure from life on the croſs, or his departure from this viſible world by his aſcenſion ; of all important ſubjects, the moſt important.

Their ſudden diſappearance, leaving Chriſt alone on the mountain, indicates that the law and prophets were no more ; that to Chriſt alone the world muſt look for ſalvation and inſtruction ; that in him all types and figures were fulfilled.

They appeared in glory to inform us that Chriſt's elect will be ſimilar to him ; to engage us to perſevere in the rugged path, which he has traced, in order to arrive at the end, a glimpſe of which had thrown the witneſſes into an exſtacy. Other rea-

ſons

ſons are aſſigned, but theſe are ſufficient to evince not only the truth, but the neceſſity of this miracle.

It is with great propriety called a transfiguration ; the Greek term *morphè* uniformly ſignifies the exterior appearance, or figure, not the eſſential parts which conſtitute the ſubſtance, both in the old and new teſtament : thus, Daniel iv, 33, " my ſhape returned," *morphē mou*, and V. 6. " then the King's countenance" *morphē* " was changed," Mark xvi, 12, " he was ſhewn in another ſhape, *etere morphē*."

In his transfiguration the change was confined to the exterior form : " his face was reſplendent as the ſun, and his clothes were white as ſnow.

Chriſt's inſtruction to the Samaritan woman was not intended for her excluſively ; millions have learned from it " that God is a ſpirit, and muſt be adored in ſpirit and truth ; that the time was come when ſacrifices, either in the temple of Jeruſalem, or the mount of Garazim, would be no longer acceptable." Was it from the Samaritan that Chriſt had learned theſe ſecrets ? If ſo ſhe was a moſt intelligent woman. Theſe imaginary diſeaſes, which our ſceptics have detected, are ſtrong indications of ſome mental derangement at home ; in all imaginary diſtempers there is ſomething real, the patient miſtakes it. Moral remedies may engage him to have recourſe to proper phyſical remedies, and ſo remove the diſeaſe ; our ſophiſts are diſeaſed at heart, the head feels it, but miſtakes the nature and ſeat of the diſtemper. Obſtinacy, the eldeſt daughter of pride, renders their diſeaſe incurable. Is the imagination of a dead man eaſily rectified ? of a man born blind ? his imagination muſt be a moſt powerful agent to form the organs of ſight inſtantaneouſly. Does imagination cure the deaf, the dumb, the maimed ? Women afflicted, the one eighteen years, another twelve,

twelve, with no uncommon diſeaſe, an iſſue of blood? There is ſomething ſo ſtupidly impudent in pretending to invalidate a well atteſted fact, by a furniſed poſſibility, that it is irkſome to diſcuſs it.

We are come to the laſt ſubterfuge of impiety, the miracles of Chriſt are not atteſted by the Jews; the controverſial writings of the Jews, in which theſe miracles were refuted, might have been ſuppreſſed by the Chriſtians; it appears, even from the Evangeliſts, that he did not heal all the ſick, who were brought to him; that he healed but one at the Pool of Bethſaida, though there were many ſick there at the time; that he could not work miracles in his own country. All theſe circumſtances, ſay our ſophiſts, found a ſuſpicion that his hiſtory was ſuppoſed by the Evangeliſts, and that there was nothing real in his pretended miracles.

How theſe ſublime writers diſcovered that Chriſt's miracles were not atteſted by the Jews, we plain men are at a loſs to conjecture, the Apoſtles were Jews, the primitive Church in Jeruſalem, conſiſting of many thouſands, of whom a great number were of the ſacerdotal order, was entirely compoſed of Jews: all theſe believed, and atteſted, the miracles of Chriſt. The Scribes and Phariſees, his avowed enemies, did not deny them: they had recourſe to artful evaſions to elude the force of them. Cavilling on the circumſtance of the Sabbath, as if it were unlawful to heal the ſick on that day, if they found no circumſtance to cenſure, aſcribing them to Beelzebub; but the facts they did not deny, nor do their deſcendants, to the preſent day.

When we are told who were theſe Jewiſh writers, who refuted the miracles of Chriſt, how, when, by whom, or where, their works have been ſuppreſſed; why the Jews connived at ſuch ſuppreſſion, we ſhall diſcuſs

diſcuſs that article. We have yet the works of Joſephus, an able writer, and more able ſtateſman, who never failed to ſacrifice truth to his political views: a ſtriking inſtance we have in his Hiſtory of the Jewiſh Antiquities. In it he artfully diminiſhes the force of the miracles recorded in the Old Teſtament, and throws a ſhade over every thing he thought might give offence to the Heathens. His application of the prophecies concerning the Meſſias, to Veſpaſian, a Heathen Emperor, has damned his memory, without redemption. Yet in his works, however grateful it might have been to his patrons, we find no refutation of the miracles of Chriſt, or his Apoſtles; nor do we find any ſuch refutation in the works of Philo, a better man, though not more favourable to Chriſtianity; its doctrines he profeſſedly rejects: in that book, which he entitled, "Abraham's Migrations," he ſays, there were amongſt the Jews a ſort of people, who thought the laws were nothing elſe but ſigns of ſpiritual things; that they condemned the letter to ſeek the ſpirit; that they endeavoured to aboliſh the ſabbath, circumciſion and feſtivals, introduced by Moſes; that, in their opinion, true circumciſion conſiſted in repreſſing evil deſires and affections. He accuſes theſe innovators of inconſtancy and levity, exhorts his fellow Jews to reſiſt theſe new opinions, and make no change in what had been wiſely eſtabliſhed by their anceſtors.

The ſeverity of his cenſure, on the new doctrine, as ſubverſive of the rites and ceremonies of the Moſaic Law, which the Chriſtians uniformly taught to have been figurative, and to have ceaſed on the eſtabliſhment of the new law, is deciſive evidence that he would have attempted to invalidate the miracles, by which its divine original is atteſted, if he ſaw any probability of ſucceſs. To have mentioned them, without

without a ſolid refutation, would have been ruinous to his cauſe, he therefore wiſely paſſed them unnoticed. This reaſoning is applicable to Joſephus, though the more intelligent Critics judge that paſſage, in which he ſpeaks of Chriſt and his miracles, genuine; it is in his ſtyle; the occaſion required it: ſpeaking of Pilate, he could not with propriety have omitted the moſt remarkable event of his adminiſtration. Euſebius, a moſt diligent writer, cites it, Demon. Evan. Lib. 3, N. 7, and alſo. Hiſt. Ecc. Lib. 1, Cap. 1. Nicephorus—Hiſt. Ecc. Lib. 1, Cap. 1. Suidas—Lex. Art. Joſephē, and Jerom, cite it. Joſephus ſpeaks of John Baptiſt, Lib. 18, Cap. 5, N. 6. and of St. James, the brother of our Lord, Lib. 20, Cap. 9. N. 1. Of theſe teſtimonies, though rejected by ſome modern Critics, there is concluſive evidence: Origen cites them, in his book againſt Celſus, No. 47, which he would not dare to have done, if they were not genuine. They are alſo cited by Euſebius, Hiſt. Ecc. Lib. 2, Cap. 23, and by St. Jerom, De. Scrip. Eccl.

The paſſage is found in the 18th Book of Jewiſh Antiquities, Chap. 3, No. 4, and is thus conceived: "at that time (that is in Pilate's time) was Jeſus, a wiſe man, if it be juſt to call him a man: for he was the effector of wonderful works; the teacher of men, who receive truth with pleaſure; he attracted many Jews and many Gentiles. This was that Chriſt, whom Pilate, on the delation of our chief men, crucified; they who had loved him before did not ceaſe to love him; he appeared to them on the third day, returned to life. Theſe and a thouſand other wonderful things, had been foretold by the Prophets; from him aroſe the nation of Chriſtians, which continues to the preſent day."

There are ſtrong reaſons to ſuſpect an interpolation, but none concluſive. Joſephus did not believe in

Chriſt—true, he did not believe him God equal to his eternal father, as the diſciples did; but it is not clear that he did not believe him to be the Meſſias announced by the Prophets: he moſt certainly did not believe Veſpaſian, a profeſſed idolater, to be the Meſſias, though, courtier like, he flattered him with the title. He might, like his brethren of whom St. John ſpeaks, have believed in him, and not avow it: becauſe, ſays the Evangeliſt, they "loved the glory of men more than the glory of God." John xii, 43.

This teſtimony has not been cited by the primitive apologiſts of chriſtianity. True: they did not reſt the juſtice of their cauſe on the authority of a court flatterer, whoſe duplicity they abhorred. His authority would have no force againſt the heathens, with whom they reaſoned; it might have ſome weight with the Jews; but they did not diſpute the truth of Chriſt's miracles; they aſcribed them to magic, which they had learned in Egypt, and endeavored to elude the force of them under different pretences.

It is ſaid that the chriſtians, in the third century, inſerted the paſſage in Joſephus's work. That is extremely improbable: no reaſon can be aſſigned why the chriſtians ſhould interpolate a work, which they at all times diſregarded, and continue to diſregard. The authority of a court flatterer, who ſacrifices truth to private views, is of little weight for, or againſt, any cauſe. Chriſtian writers adduce vouchers of an unblemiſhed character. It is highly probable that the paſſage was retrenched from many copies by the Jews, becauſe it is not very honorable to themſelves, or their anceſtors.

That Chriſt did not work miracles, at the requiſition of the Phariſees, is true; he diſregarded the deſire of Herod alſo. It was inconſiſtent with his wiſdom to gratify idle curioſity. The miracles, which the

the Phariſees had ſeen, only ſerved to increaſe their animoſity: "There came to him the blind and the lame, in the temple, and he healed them. The Chief Prieſts, and Phariſees, ſeeing the wonderful things which he did, and hearing the children crying out, and ſaying—Hoſanna to the Son of David—were moved with indignation." Math. xxi, 15–16. The ſigns, which they required, would not diminiſh the virulence of their ulcerated minds.

If he could not work miracles in his own country, it was not through impotence, but becauſe he could not, with propriety, work miracles amongſt an incredulous people, which would have no other effect but to render them inexcuſable, we find him reward the piety of ſome, even there: "he did not work many miracles, on account of their incredulity." Matth. xiii, 58. And Mark, who ſays that he could not work any miracles, there adds, in the ſame ſentence, that he healed a few ſick perſons. Mark vi, 5. In the ſame ſenſe the Angel ſaid to Lot, Gen. xix, 22, "I can do nothing until you go there (to Segor.) The Angel's power was independent on Lot's ſafety; but he could not, with propriety, exerciſe his terrible commiſſion until Lot was in a place of ſafety.

The immediate effect of Chriſt's miracles was to manifeſt, to the Jews, the divinity of his miſſion, and, by neceſſary conſequence, the truth of his doctrine: when he changed the water into wine at Cana: the Evangeliſt ſays "he manifeſted his glory, and his diſciples believed in him," John ii, 11; and he adds, v, 23, "when he was at Jeruſalem, at the Paſſover upon the Feſtival Day, many believed in his name, ſeeing the ſigns which he effected." Hence Nicodemus came at night, and ſaid to him: "Rabbi, we know that you came from God a teacher: for no one can do theſe ſigns, which you do, if God be not with him." John

iii,

iii, 2. For the truth of his miſſion Chriſt frequently appealed to his miracles. Thus, John v, 36, he ſaid to the Jews: "But I have a greater teſtimony than that of John: the works, which the father hath given me, that I may effect them; theſe works, which I do, they give teſtimony of me, that the father ſent me. Immediately before he ordered Lazarus to riſe from the tomb, he lift up his eyes to his father, ſaying: "I thank thee that thou haſt heard me; I knew that thou heareſt me always, but becauſe of the people, who ſtand about, have I ſaid it, that they may believe that thou haſt ſent me." John xi, 42.

His miracles, atteſting the divinity of his miſſion, and thereby rendering the truth of his doctrine unqueſtionable, afford concluſive evidence of his divinity. To raiſe to life, or form the organs of ſight, is not within the limits of created power. Hence the blind man, in reply to the Phariſees, ſays: "From the age it has not been heard that any man opened the eyes of one born blind." John ix, 32.

It was not by invocation, but by his own inherent power, that Chriſt effected theſe works, which tranſcend the limits of created power. Hence St. Luke ſays, vi, 19, "a virtue *(dunamis)* went out from him, and healed them all." He taught expreſsly that he was God, one with the father, poſſeſſed of the ſame independent and almighty power; and, in confirmation of this truth, he frequently appealed to his miracles. Thus when the Jews ſurrounded him, in Solomon's porch, and ſaid: "How long will you keep us in ſuſpence? If you be the Chriſt (the Meſſias) tell us plainly. Jeſus anſwered them: I ſpeak to you, and you do not believe me; the works, which I do, in the name of the father, they give teſtimony of me." John x, 25. After declaring that he would give eternal life to his ſheep,

that

that no power could wreſt them out of his hands, he aſſigns the reaſon—becauſe no power can wreſt them out of the hand of the father—he immediately adds: *I and the father are one*; that is, one in eſſence, one in power. The Jews took up ſtones to ſtone him for blaſphemy: becauſe, ſaid they, "that, being a man, you make yourſelf God." To which he replied, that in their law the Prophets were, in a certain ſenſe, called Gods, without blaſphemy; that it was not blaſphemy in him, whom God had ſanctified, and ſent into the world, to call himſelf Son of God: "If I do not the works of my father," ſaid he, 37, "believe me not; but if I do, though you will not believe me, believe the works: that you may know, and believe, that the father is in me, and I in the father." John x.

He in the ſame manner offered his miracles in proof of his divinity when Philip deſired to ſee the father: "do you not believe ſaid he, that I am in the father and the father in me? Otherwiſe believe me for theſe works," John xiv, 11.

And becauſe theſe his miracles were irreſiſtible proofs of his divinity, he declared that the Jews who perſiſted in their incredulity, were inexcuſable, "if I did not come and ſpeak to them, they would not have ſin; but now they have no excuſe for their ſin. He who hates me, hates my father. If I had not done works in them, which no other did, they would not have ſin; but now they have ſeen, and they hate both me and my father," John XV. 22, &c.

The divinity of Chriſt, manifeſt in his works and words, the Jews refuſed to acknowledge. This article of his doctrine they clearly underſtood, and of all others moſt ſtrenuouſly oppoſed. They perſecuted him for a pretended violation of the ſabbath, becauſe he had healed a ſick man at the pool of Bethſaida

Bethſaida on that day; but their indignation was increaſed beyond meaſure at his reply, in which his equality with the father was ſtated: "Chriſt replied to them: my father worketh until now, and I alſo work. For this, therefore, the Jews ſought yet more to kill him, not only becauſe he broke the ſabbath, but becauſe he ſaid that God was his proper father, "*Patera idion*," making himſelf equal to God," John V. 17, and ſeq.

The Jews therefore underſtood his doctrine in the true ſenſe, that he was Son of God by nature, not by adoption: in this latter ſenſe there could have been no accuſation of blaſphemy: for the Jews called themſelves the Sons of God by adoption: "They ſaid then to him: we are not born of fornication, we have one father, God." John viii, 41.

That it was the intended ſenſe is manifeſt—the words can bear no other ſignification—"The father worketh until now, and I work as if he had ſaid though the father had ceaſed on the Sabbath Day, from the works, which he had created, he yet continues to create, and to preſerve his creatures, without a violation of the Sabbath—this, his operation, is mine, in it there is no violation of the Sabbath. So far from diminiſhing the force of an expreſſion, which had excited their indignation, he continued to explain it more clearly: "Then Jeſus anſwered, and ſaid to them: Amen, amen, the Son cannot do any thing of himſelf but what he ſees the father do: for what things ſoever he does, theſe the Son alſo does in like manner ..... as the father raiſes the dead, and gives life, ſo the Son gives life to whom he will ..... that all men may honor the Son as they honor the father—he who does not honor the Son does not honor the father, who ſent him ..... Amen, amen, I ſay unto you, the hour comes, it is now, when the dead ſhall hear the

the voice of the Son of God, and they who will hear ſhall live: for as the father hath life in himſelf, ſo he hath given to the Son to have life in himſelf." *ibidem.*

In the whole of this diſcourſe he claims the ſame power, the ſame honor, the ſame life in himſelf, that is, the ſame eternity, in a word, the ſame divine nature with the father; and, for the truth of this doctrine, he refers them to the teſtimony of the father, manifeſt in his works: "I have," ſaid he, "a greater teſtimony than that of John—the works which the father gave me to effect, theſe works, which I perform give teſtimony of me, that the father ſent me," *ibidem.* Their incredulity he declared inexcuſable, becauſe it was the reſult of groundleſs, and virulent animoſity, condemned by the voice of reaſon: for where there is an exerciſe of the divine power, reaſon, ſays the agent, muſt be God; they ſaw this power in its effects, and obſtinately refuſed to acknowledge the divinity of the agent.

As Chriſt taught by word and example he frequently recommended ſecrecy to thoſe, whom he relieved, giving his diſciples to underſtand that vanity is to have no ſhare in their works. The deſire of popular applauſe is a vice which he ſeverely cenſured in the Phariſees. It is at preſent, as it was then, the ſpring of action in the ſons of pride. Our modern ſceptics, in imitation of their anceſtors, the Heathen Philoſophers, think it a virtue.

Of the miracles of Chriſt many were of ſuch a nature as not to be concealed. The feeding of four or five thouſand people, with a few loaves, the reſurrection of the widow of Naim's ſon, that of Lazarus, and many other miracles, were facts of public notoriety, which could not be concealed.

So public, ſo well atteſted, and ſo univerſally believed were the miracles of Chriſt, that the heathen writers

writers againſt Chriſtianity admitted them: we learn from Origen's firſt book againſt Celſus, No. 49, and ſeq. that this irreconcileable enemy to Chriſtianity believed the miracles of Chriſt genuine, he endeavoured to invalidate their force, under pretence that ſuch prodigies had been effected by magicians.

Porphyrius, not leſs inimical than Celſus, inadvertently acknowledged Chriſt's power over their pretended Gods: "ſince that Jeſus is worſhipped," ſaid he, Ab. Euſ. Preſſ. Evan. Lib. 5°. Cap. 1°, "we can obtain no advantage from the Gods, nor is it wonderful if, after ſo many years, the city be afflicted, ſince Æſculapius and the other Gods are abſent from it.

"That philoſopher," ſays St. Auſtin, De. Liv. Dei. Lib. 19, Cap. 23, No. 2, "ſpeaks well of Chriſt, as if forgetting the contumely of which we have ſpoken; or, as if the Gods in a dream had blaſphemed Chriſt, and, awaking, knew him to be good and worthy of praiſe. Finally, as if going to pronounce ſomething wonderful and incredible, Porphyrius ſays it will appear to ſome extraordinary what we are going to ſay: the Gods have pronounced that Chriſt moſt pious, and made immortal, and remembered him with good words. He then," continues St. Auſtin, "ſubjoins ſome oracles of the Gods blaſphemings Chriſtians, and after this he ſays: to thoſe who aſked if Chriſt was a God, Hecate replied: ſince you know how the immortal ſoul walks after the body, but that which is cut off from wiſdom for ever wanders. That ſoul is of a moſt excellent man for piety, this they (the Chriſtians) adore, truth being far from them." After St. Auſtin had cited ſome other oracles, from Porphyrius, to the honor of Chriſt, though not ſo to Chriſtians, he thus concludes, No. 3, "who does not ſee that theſe oracles were forged

forged by this artful enemy, who, whilſt he praiſes Chriſt, traduces Chriſtians, or, if ſuch anſwers were given by theſe unclean ſpirits, they were intended to preclude the way of ſalvation, in which a man muſt be a Chriſtian.

Hierocles, who, under Diocleſien, perſecuted Chriſtianity with his ſword and his pen, in the book which he inſcribed *Philalethe*, inveighs againſt Chriſtians, who praiſed Chriſt for reſtoring ſight to the blind, and doing other things equally wonderful. He inſtitutes a compariſon between the miracles of Chriſt, and thoſe of Apollonius, of Tyane, after adducing many pretended miracles of this celebrated impoſtor, he thus concludes: "to what end have I commemorated theſe things? That our ſolid and accurate judgment of all things may appear, and the levity of Chriſtians: we do not think him, who has done theſe great things a God, but a man dear and pleaſing to the Gods, they on the contrary for a few prodigies call their Jeſus *God*."

As to the pretended miracles of Apollonius of Tyane, which are ſaid to have been written by his colleague Darias, and repeated by Philoſtratus two hundred years after, from ſome memorials furniſhed by Julia, wife to the Emperor Septimus Severus. They are a tiſſue of abſurd fables, offenſive to common ſenſe. Philoſtratus, who ſeems to have the moſt profound reſpect for his hero, makes him underſtand the language of birds and beaſts, which, he ſays, he learnt from the Arabs. In the 8th chapter of his 4th book, he ſays, that Apollonius, invited to the wedding of his friend Menippas, whilſt they were at table, informed his friend that the bride was a ſhe demon, the ſhe demon immediately diſappeared, leaving them all in conſternation and fear. In this rhapſody there are many tales equally abſurd.

A judicious critic, ſpeaking of Philoſtratus, ſays: his work excites a contempt for the hiſtorian, and indignation againſt the impoſtor, whoſe hiſtory he writes. In defence of the hiſtorian, ſome pretend that it was a romance, which he compoſed for the amuſement of the Empreſs, his benefactreſs.

Even Julian, the apoſtate, whoſe hatred knew no bounds, though he affected to deſpiſe Chriſtians, whom he called Galileans, admitted the miracles of Chriſt. It is true that ill-fated miſcreant was ſo infatuated with the myſterious rites of augurs, ſoothſayers, and magicians, that he thought greater miracles might have been effected by them. Hence he ſays that Chriſt done nothing great, "if it be not thought a great matter that he cured the lame and blind, and adjured ſome people poſſeſſed by demons, in the ſtreets of Bethſaida and Bethania," Ap. Cyr. Lib. 6, Con. Jul.

Whatever ſigns apparently tranſcending the power of man, and exciting his aſtoniſhment, the artful illuſions of Anti-Chriſt, or other falſe Prophets, may ſeem to effect, or the Demon, by his ſagacity in diſcovering natural agents, and his power of transferring them almoſt inſtantaneouſly from places however diſtant, and applying them to ſubjects naturally diſpoſed for their reception, may in reality effect, none can be deceived by theſe ſigns, but thoſe who are willing to be deceived, becauſe they have been told that ſuch ſigns would be given by falſe Prophets, in order to deceive. In the pretended miracles of Anti-Chriſt there will be nothing real: St. Paul expreſsly calls them *lying prodigies*, 2. Theſs. ii. 9. He there aſſigns the reaſon why God will permit theſe illuſions to impoſe on the wicked: "becauſe," ſays he, "they did not receive the charity of truth," that is, the truth in charity. It has been already obſerved,

that

that the operation of the Demon, in order to deceive, is one of God's moſt fevere judgments ; but he permits no ſuch operation in his own name, nor in any conjuncture, in which reaſon cannot diſcover the cheat.

Of all facts upon record, in the annals of the world, there is not one ſo well atteſted as the reſurrection of Chriſt, and his aſcenſion into Heaven ; his greateſt enemies have, by their exertions to efface his name, rendered the fact of his reſurrection incontrovertible : ſhortly after his interment the Jews, who had conſpired againſt him, came to Pilate, and told him that *the Seducer*, as they called Chriſt, had promiſed to riſe from the dead after three days, if the body ſhould diſappear, this would eſtabliſh all the errors, which he had taught. Pilate directed them to take the guard, and ſecure the ſepulchre. Nothing was omitted which prudence could ſuggeſt. The effect of theſe precautions was to remove the moſt diſtant ſuſpicion of illuſion, and make the moſt inveterate enemies of Chriſt, the firſt witneſſes of his triumph. They did not atteſt the fact ; true. Few men are fond to give evidence of their own guilt ; but their only ſubterfuge is equal to a confeſſion ; the diſciples, ſay they, ſtole the body whilſt the guards ſlept. The teſtimony of a ſleeping witneſs is a mockery, to paſs unnoticed the improbability of a guard of well diſciplined ſoldiers all ſleeping on their poſt at the ſame time, and the impoſſibility of removing a great ſtone from the entrance of the ſepulchre, and carrying off the body, without awaking any one of them.

The falſehood of the ſuppoſition is manifeſt ; if the diſciples had ſtolen the body, they muſt have known that he did not riſe from the dead ; that he was an impoſtor, who impoſed on their ſimplicity ; and,

and, as for his ſake, they had expoſed themſelves to the enmity of their nation, they muſt have then at leaſt abandoned him. The contrary has happened; though they baſely deſerted him before his death, whilſt they had great expectancies from his power; and could hardly prevail on themſelves to believe his reſurrection real, after they had ſeen him, yet, upon conviction of the truth, they were no more to be deterred by threats or tortures, by torments or death. Their words and actions breathe nothing but ſincerity. They did not remove to a diſtant country, nor did they wait until time had effaced the memory of the tranſaction; but whilſt it was yet recent, whilſt the impreſſion of his ignominious death was yet ſtrong on the public mind, they appeared in the temple, where the Prieſts preſided, who were his accuſers, there they atteſted the truth: it was believed by thouſands, and not denied by Chriſt's moſt inveterate enemies. Their charge againſt the principal Jews was of the moſt atrocious kind: "The God of Abraham, of Iſaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, glorified his ſon Jeſus, whom you delivered over, and denied before Pilate, who judged him to be diſmiſſed; but you denied the juſt and the holy one, and deſired a murderer to be granted to you; but the author of life you killed, whom God raiſed from the dead, of which we are witneſſes," Acts iii, 13, 14, 15. An accuſation of a more heinous nature is not upon record in the annals of mankind. And this accuſation is founded on the fact of Chriſt's reſurrection: for if he did not riſe he was an impoſtor, and the Jews were perfectly juſtifiable in putting him to death. The chief prieſts and magiſtrates of the temple aſſembled, and put Peter and John into confinement; the day following the accuſation was repeated, and the fact of the reſurrection, on which it reſted, was aſſerted

aſſerted in public council before Annas, Caiphas, John, Alexander, and all who were of the Sacerdotal order; there was no denial of the fact, nor any attempt whatſoever to refute it. To pretend that the principal Jews, men of wealth and power, poſſeſſed of every poſſible means of information, would not refute an accuſation, reflecting diſhonor on themſelves, if it were poſſible, is to miſtake the nature of man. Their acquieſcence is more than juridical evidence of the truth. It is equally abſurd to imagine that Peter and John would make ſuch a charge, and ſo confidently aſſert the reſurrection of Chriſt in confirmation of the charge, if they were not well aſſured of the truth of the fact, and the impoſſibility of invalidating it by any artifice or evaſion.

The candour of the apoſtles, their labours, their ſufferings, their deaths, is concluſive evidence of their ſincerity. The bold, and open manner, in which they atteſt truths deſtructive of the honor of their nation, damning, without redemption, the memory of the principal Jews, in whoſe preſence they ſpoke, is equally convincing that, if they intended to deceive, they could not have done it. Impoſtors have intereſted views: they had none, they were men of truth. The man who reads their hiſtory and denies it, does not know the truth.

Why did not Chriſt ſhew himſelf to all the Jews after his reſurrection? There was no neceſſity. He did not riſe for the conviction of the Jews, but for the juſtification of Chriſtians until the conſummation of time; it was therefore neceſſary that he ſhould convince competent witneſſes of the truth of his reſurrection; that it ſhould be aſcertained to them, and by them, to all nations, beyond the poſſibility of a doubt: this was effectually done. It was declared by angels, the meſſengers of Heaven: "He is riſen he

is

is not here." Luke xxiv. 6. He heard them; he answered them; he eat with them; he instructed them; he shewed them his wounds, from the nails and the spear; they touched them; by every possible argument he convinced them, that he was risen in the same solid body, in which he suffered. If he had shewn himself in the temple it would have convinced the Priests: many of them were convinced, and embraced the faith on the testimony of the apostles; they, who obstinately persevered in their incredulity, would not have been convinced by his appearance, and from the abuse of the favors, which he had shewn were not deserving of more, add to this that the question would again recur if he had shewn himself in the temple why not in the court? Why not in every street of the city? Why not in Samaria? And, as the effect of the resurrection was not to be confined to the Jewish people exclusively, why not in Rome, in Athens, &c.? And as all succeeding generations were equally interested with the then existing generation, on the principle laid down by modern sceptics, Christ's appearance would have been necessary at all times, and in all places. A leader of the squad thought it incumbent on Christ to appear to himself; the writer ventures to assure him that he will, in due time, not to gratify idle curiosity, but to chastise arrogance and impiety.

The credulity of an ignorant populace is the last resource of our sophists. There is nothing, say they, which the populace will not easily believe, if it be told by men of influence: thus the Romans believed Julius Proculus, that Romulus had descended from the Heavens to inform him, that he was amongst the Gods; not only the populace, but the senate ordered a temple to be built in honour of the new God. Alexander declaring that Hephestion, was deified,

was

was believed by the courtiers, and ſhortly after it was believed by himſelf: thus the Apoſtles imagined that Chriſt roſe from the dead, and the populace believed them without farther diſcuſſion.

It is true, a credulous populace eaſily believes what flatters their paſſions, if aſſerted by men of confidence. The enrolment of Romulus, Hepheſtion, or any other pretended divinity, only encreaſed their amuſements, and was accompanied by no reſtraints, they were of courſe received with acclamation, without examination or diſcuſſion. The Senators were ſtrongly, and in all probability juſtly, ſuſpected of having diſpoſed of Romulus in a clandeſtine manner, it is not matter of ſurpriſe that they pretended to believe Proculus, who was employed by them for the expreſs purpoſe of removing the ſuſpicion; but when we ſee the Jewiſh Prieſts, not the populace, ſilent under an accuſation reflecting the utmoſt diſhonour on themſelves, the moſt intelligent amongſt them convinced of the Reſurrection, on which the charge was ſupported, the idea of popular credulity vaniſhes, an emotion of ſurpriſe at the perverſe obſtinacy of the incredulous ſucceeds. How our Sceptics diſcovered that the Diſciples were of the loweſt orders of ſociety, we are a loſs to conjecture: was Gamaliel, Nicodemus, or Joſeph, of Arimathea, of the loweſt order? Were Stephen, Barnaby, Luke, and Paul, of the populace? Was that immenſe body of the Sacerdotal order, who embraced the faith of the credulous herd? If we may judge of a writer by his works, Luke and Paul were men of ſcience, as far ſuperior to Sceptical ſcribblers, as theſe are to their brother monkeys.

Let us admit the Diſciples were ſuch as our Sceptics ſuppoſe them, ignorant and credulous, how did theſe ignorant and credulous men impoſe their apparently

parently and incredible doctrines on the moſt incredulous of men, the Heathen Philoſophers? How did they enforce obedience to their injunctions, which are confeſſedly full of the moſt mortifying reſtraints? Theſe are embarraſſing queſtions.

The reſurrection of Chriſt, and other ſpeculative doctrines of his religion, were in direct oppoſition to the received opinions of the world, its moral maxims equally inimical to the eſtabliſhed maxims of the world, beatifying poverty, humility, chaſtity, modeſty, meekneſs and patience; denouncing the divine vengeance, againſt avarice, ambition, incontinence, and all the prevailing paſſions of man; it propoſed nothing leſs than the total abolition of idolatry, the deſtruction of all the Heathen temples, the ſuppreſſion of all ſuperſtitious rites and ceremonies, which had been univerſally eſtabliſhed by immemorial cuſtom, authorized and confirmed by Legiſlatures, interwoven with the fundamental laws of Kingdoms and States, flattering all the inclinations of man. Add to this, that theſe doctrines, ſo apparently incredible, and theſe moral maxims, in reality ſo inimical to corrupt nature, were taught by men of no influence; in their own country, hated and perſecuted; amongſt the Heathen nations deſpiſed; oppoſed by wealth, power, intereſt, ſcience, and every artifice, which the malice of the Demon could invent. Theſe difficulties, to human power invincible, were ſurmounted by the irreſiſtible evidence of Chriſt's Reſurrection.

His aſcenſion is a fact atteſted as forcibly, and with the ſame ſucceſs. In it there is no room for deception: the witneſſes were numerous; they could not have been all ſubject to the ſame illuſion at the ſame inſtant of time. He had ſpoken to them, he had eaten with them, he had conducted them from the

the city through Bethania to the mountain of Olives, and there, bleſſing them, he aſcended in their view. See the relation, Acts i.

It is not in the nature of things that ſo many witneſſes would conſpire to atteſt a fact, knowing it to be a fiction, without having ſome great intereſt in view. The Apoſtles could have no temporal intereſt in view: from the Jews, whoſe ſanguine hopes of the re-eſtabliſhment of their empire, they blaſted, and whoſe total deſtruction they foretold, they could promiſe themſelves nothing; from the Heathens, whoſe rites they ſuppreſſed, whoſe augurs, ſoothſayers, oracles and temples, they taught the people to deſpiſe, the vanity and emptineſs of whoſe pretended Gods and Goddeſſes they expoſed, the folly of whoſe ſuppliants they ridiculed, the artifices of whoſe officers they diſcloſed, from theſe once more they could expect nothing but what they obtained, that is, chains, tortures and death. Their object therefore muſt have been, as they aſſerted, the converſion of ſouls, and the ſanctification of their own. It is true, they promiſed happineſs to their diſciples, as they did to themſelves, but not in this world, and it would have been madneſs to expect happineſs in an after life, for teaching that for truth, which they knew to be falſe. The doctrine they taught was therefore true; and when they declared that "the anger of God is revealed from Heaven againſt impiety," Rom. i. 18, our Sceptics will find it but too true.

From Juſtin's apology, addreſſed to the Emperor, the Senate, and Roman people, we learn that Tiberius had been informed by Pilate of the principal occurrences of Chriſt's miſſion in Judea; after relating many of theſe tranſactions, he ſays, No. 7, "that theſe things have happened you may learn

from the acts of Pontius Pilate." The same assertion he repeats, No. 48. We know that it was invariably the custom for the Governors of Provinces, to transmit to the Emperor a circumstantial account of singular incidents. Pilate cannot be presumed to have omitted it, and Justin would not have dared to appeal to the public records if he were not well assured the facts were registered, nor would his adversary, Crescentius, the cynic, a most malignant censor, have passed such a mistake unnoticed.

Tertullian also, a writer well versed in the Roman laws, says, in his Apologetic, Cap. 21°, No. 7, " that Pilate himself, a Christian in conscience, had reported to the Emperor Tiberius the most memorable occurrences of Christ's mission." He adds, in the same Apology, that Tiberius proposed the Divinity of Christ to the Senate, " with the prerogative of his own suffrage." The Senate refused to ratify it. Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, cites these facts from Tertullian, whose authority he thought unexceptionable: " when," says Eus. Lib. 2, Cap. 2, " the wonderful resurrection of Christ and his ascension into Heaven was published by the voice of all people, as it was an old custom with the Governors of Provinces to transmit an account of every new occurrence to the Emperor, that nothing might be concealed, Pilate informed Tiberius of the resurrection of Christ, the fame of which was celebrated over all Palestine; he at the same time signified to the Prince, that he had heard of many other miracles, and that after his return to life he was held by many to be a God; it is said that Tiberius referred the matter to the Senate, and they rejected the proposal, because he had been declared God without waiting their authority, and there was an old law forbidding any person to be a God without a decree of

of the Senate. This was the apparent reaſon, but in reality becauſe the preaching of the divine doctrine did not want the authority or the counſel of men. Though the Senate had rejected the propoſal, as was ſaid, Tiberius, perſiſting in his opinion, decreed nothing harſh againſt the doctrine of Chriſt. Theſe things Tertullian, a writer well verſed in the Roman laws, and amongſt Latin writers the moſt celebrated, ſtates in his Apologetic."

Some of our modern Legiſlatures declare that no doctrine is true but that which they find convenient to approve; the Roman ſenate went one ſtep farther: they made the divinity ſelf dependant on their decree. The impiety of this law is ſurpaſſed, if poſſible, by its folly. The candidate is introduced canvaſing for votes, if he cannot obtain a majority he falls from all his pretenſions to the divinity. *Si hominibus non placet deus non erit.*

There is a letter from Pilate to Tiberius re porting the miracles of Chriſt; it is thought by ſome modern critics to be ſuppoſed though cited by Tertullian. The writer has not ſeen concluſive evidence of the ſuppoſition. There is no modern critic better verſed in the hiſtory of Rome, and its laws than Tertullian, a profeſſed lawyer, and eminent in the profeſſion; no modern critic has, or can pretend to have the ſame ſources of information, which he poſſeſſed, if the letter tranſmitted to us be that, which he cites, and is cited on his authority by Euſebius, a moſt intelligent author, the writer is ſtrongly inclined to prefer their authority to the ſilly conjectures of any modern, or of all modern critics. Whatever objections may be ſtated againſt Tertullian, none can be againſt Juſtin, who appealed to the public acts.

Tiberius, though corrupt in his morals and ſanguinary in his diſpoſitions, was neither ignorant, nor

inattentive

inattentive to the duties of an Emperor; and Pilate, who, if Philo and Joſephus tell truth, was little inferior to his maſter, was too deeply verſed in politics to conceal from the tyrant's ear tranſactions, which he knew muſt reach it through ſome other channel. It cannot be ſuppoſed, with any appearance of probability, that Chriſt's death and the rumour of his reſurrection was not reported to the Emperor.

Whether the letter be genuine, or ſuppoſed, is of little conſequence: the truth of chriſtianity does not reſt on the authority of a Tiberius or a Pilate; it is totally independent of the teſtimony of a Juſtin, a Tertullian, or an Euſebius.

However unexceptionable the miracles of Chriſt, however candid and ſincere the Apoſtles, yet as the religion, which they taught, was deſtructive of all the ſyſtems of religion then eſtabliſhed by laws and cuſtoms in the world; in its ſpeculative doctrines inconceiveable, and in its moral precepts full of mortifying reſtraints, they never could obtain credit on their bare aſſertion in theſe countries, where Chriſt himſelf or his miracles were not known; their teſtimony therefore muſt have been accompanied by ſigns, which authenticated their miſſion, and inſured their followers againſt illuſion. In Judea where they firſt began to preach, the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt under the appearance of fiery tongues, and the permanent effect of this temporary appearance, was a ſufficient voucher; the aſſembly was too numerous to be ſubject to any illuſion, and the effect, ſuch as omnipotence alone could produce: it is not poſſible that an ignorant man, by any powers inherent in human nature, ſhould inſtantaneouſly acquire a knowledge of different languages: and, much leſs, that he ſhould be underſtood by men of different languages at the ſame time. This was the firſt miracle in atteſtation of the

the truth of the Apoſtle's miſſion ; and its immediate effect was the converſion of three thouſand. Acts ii. If the reader wiſhes to ſee the miracles, which God wrought by his Apoſtles, in many different countries, let him read the Acts of the Apoſtles written by St. Luke, and atteſted by the acceptation of all the Churches in the different countries where, and in whoſe preſence, theſe miracles were wrought.

Impiety is forced to admit that the Apoſtles did convert many thouſands in different countries to the faith. To pretend that theſe converſions were wrought without miracles ; or that ſo many thouſands of men, who had eyes and ears as we have, were taught to believe that miracles were wrought in their preſence, though no ſuch thing had happened, is a manifeſt abſurdity, which is refuted by contempt. There have been ſuppoſed miracles. True, the writer is willing to admit that ſome dupes have been deceived by impoſtors : there are many ſuch in all countries to this preſent day, and in all appearance will continue to the end ; but that of all the men ſo celebrated for ſcience, ſanctity, and diſintereſted views, who have atteſted theſe miracles of the Apoſtles, and of their diſciples, there was not one honeſt man ; and that all theſe thouſands of thouſands of Chriſtians, who compoſed the primitive Church, were dupes and impoſtors ; there is ſomething ſo wild in the thought, ſo extravagantly impudent in the aſſertion, that a man who has any remains either of modeſty or common ſenſe, would not dare to make it. And if it be admitted, that any one of all theſe, told truth, impiety falls defenceleſs. How deſperate the cauſe, in defence of which, even the impudence of the Atheiſt, and the effrontery of the Deiſt, is abaſhed !

From the miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, let us paſs to his prophecies. It is univerſally admitted that,

that, contingent events depending on the joint action of many free and concurring cauſes, are not within the range of limited preſcience. Such events were foretold by Chriſt, and promiſes made by him, which almighty power alone could fulfil. The events have happened as foretold, and the promiſes fulfilled. Our Sceptics, however unwilling, are witneſſes to both.

The writer paſſes unnoticed all theſe predictions, and promiſes, which were fulfilled before the Goſpels were written, to obviate the pretence that theſe might have been ſuppoſed by the writers, the falſehood of this calumny is manifeſt, not only from the ſincerity of the Evangelical writers, but becauſe they wrote nothing but the doctrine, which they had already taught verbally; and if their writings contained a doctrine differing from what they had verbally taught, or included predictions, or promiſes, of which the Churches had not previouſly heard, they would have been rejected as ſpurious. The acceptation of all the Churches is the moſt authentic evidence of the truth of the New Teſtament, and the veracity of its writers. The ſame doctrine, which the Evangeliſts wrote, was taught by all the Apoſtles, who did not write, and continues to be taught in the ſame manner, by their ſucceſſors.

Chriſt expreſsly foretold the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, the manner of its deſtruction, and even limited the time. "The days will come on thee, ſaid he, and thy enemies will ſurround thee with a line of circumvallation, '*charaka*' and they will encompaſs thee and ſtraiten thee on every ſide, and will level thee to the ground, and thy children, *who are in thee*," Luke xix. 42. We know that Jeruſalem, the 40th year after Chriſt's death, was deſtroyed by Titus. He caſt up entrenchments, and a wall, which ſo

cloſely

cloſely inveſted the city that none could eſcape. In that memorable ſiege 1,300,000 ſouls periſhed. See Joſephus, Lib. 6 and 7. Such an event could not have been foreſeen but by him, who has all events on his diſpoſal.

As the Jews were numerous, obſtinate and diſcontented, ſubject to be deluded by impoſtors, who aſſumed the title of their expected deliverer, a man of great ſagacity might ſuſpect a rebellion; but that the city would be ſurrounded by a line of circumvallation, and totally deſtroyed by the firſt army, that inveſted it, as Chriſt ſaid Luke xxi. 20. "When you ſee Jeruſalem ſurrounded by an army know that then its deſolation is near," whilſt the then generation lived. "I ſay unto you all theſe things will came on this generation," Luke xii. 36, was contrary to all rules of probability and beyond the range of conjecture.

To this, firſt, Chriſt added a ſecond prediction, more remote from probability, that is, that though Jeruſalem would be deſtroyed, and not one ſtone left on the other, her ſons and daughters diſperſed, would continue to exiſt until the conſummation of time: after giving a deſcription of that alarming ſcene, he adds, "Amen, I ſay unto you, that this generation (the Jewiſh people) will not paſs away until all theſe things are done," Matt. xxiv. 34. Hence we find St. Paul declaring that blindneſs in part has happened in Iſrael, until the fulneſs of nations ſhould come in, and thus all Iſrael ſhall be ſaved," Rom. xi. 25, 26. Will our Sceptics condeſcend to admit the firſt part of this prophecy, that is, the fulneſs of nations is coming in, and that the blindneſs of the Jews continues yet? For their converſion we muſt wait the conſummation.

If the Jew were not invincibly obſtinate he could hardly

hardly reſiſt the evidence of another prophecy, the truth of which he knows by 1800 hundred years experience: "the law and the Prophets, ſaid Chriſt, Luke xvi, 16, until John" or, as it is in Matthew: "for all the Prophets, and the law prophecied until John," xi. 12. During the Jewiſh diſpenſation their law was ſupported, and the obſervance of it enforced by the Prophets, who appeared in regular ſucceſſion at different intervals, until John began to preach. The ſucceſſion was then interrupted, and the miſſion of Prophets to the Jews ceaſed, according to the words of Chriſt, ſo that the Atheiſt or the Deiſt is not more ſteeled againſt conviction than the unfortunate Jew.

This unanſwerable argument, drawn from the diſperſion of the Jews, and their obſtinate adherence to their law, has exerciſed the imagination of our modern Sceptics, whoſe inventive faculties are ſtretched but to deceive themſelves. They find, or pretend to find, many reaſons for this continuation of the Jews, diſtinct from all other people. Their fancy, ſay they, is fed by the hopes of a deliverer, who will reinſtate their empire, and their temple; they carefully avoid inter-marriages with other people; they are firmly attached to their law; and though they ſee the Chriſtian religion flouriſh, yet they think their own rites and ceremonies more majeſtic. To theſe reaſons the reply is ſimple: hopes diſappointed, in courſe of years ſubſide. A continuation of the Jewiſh hopes after eighteen centuries continued diſappointment, is neither natural, nor reaſonable, the ſource of ſuch extravagance muſt be found elſewhere, that is, in the malediction attached to that ill-fated race. They are the deſcendants of thoſe anceſtors, who, thirſting after the blood of innocence, to which Pilate, a ſanguinary tyrant, with reluctance gave his ſanction, exclaimed:

claimed : " let his blood be on us, and our children," Matt. xxvii, 25.

Their ſeveral attempts to build the temple have proved ineffectual, and ruinous to themſelves : Julian's project, in oppoſition to Chriſt's prophecy, only ſerved literally to verify it.

That Julian did intend to rebuild the temple, we have incontrovertible evidence in his letter to the Jews, ſtill extant in his works, No. 25. It is mentioned by Sozomen, and tranſlated by Doctor Cave, in his life of St. Cyril. In it, after relieving them from all taxes, and burdens, he enjoins diligence, and promiſes that, after his Perſian expedition, he would fix his reſidence in Jeruſalem, and offer his joint prayers with them. The artifice and hypocriſy of the apoſtate, and conſequent exertions of the Jews, have rendered the truth of Chriſt's prediction inconteſtible : Chriſt had declared, Matt. xxiv, 2, that one ſtone of the temple would not be left on the other. After the deſtruction, by Titus, the foundations and ſome ruins of the walls remained : Euſebius ſays, Dom. Evan. Lib. 8o. that in his time the inhabitants frequently carried off the ſtones for private buildings. All theſe ruins, and the very foundations, were removed by the Jews, under Julian's direction, in order to recommence the work, from which they were deterred by flames iſſuing from the foundations, which at firſt only deſtroyed the works ; but when the Jews obſtinately perſiſted in the deſign, they conſumed the workmen alſo. This fact is authentic if there be truth in man : Ammianus Marcellinus, an unprejudiced Heathen, ſays, Lib. 3, Cap. 1, that Julian undertook the work to immortalize his reign ; he adds, Lib. 23, Cap. 1, that tremendous balls of fire, iſſuing from the earth, near the foundations, rendered the place inacceſſible

to the workmen. His terms are ſtrongly expreſſive —*hocque modo elemento deſtinatius repellento*—in this manner the element in a more determined manner repelling them. The concurring teſtimony of cotemporary writers, removes all ſuſpicion. Chry. adv. Jud. Or. 2, and Hom. 4 in Matt. Nazian, Or. 2, and 4, in Jul.

Chryſoſtome ſays that the Jews at three different times attempted the building of their temple, under Adrian, which encreaſed the enmity of the Heathens, and brought deſtruction on the Jews; again under Conſtantine, who diſperſed them, cut off their ears, and branded them with the mark of rebellion; and finally, ſaid he, in our time, not above twenty years ago, in which God himſelf baffled their endeavours, to ſhew that no human power could reverſe his decrees, and that at a time when our religion was oppreſſed, lay under the axe, and had not the liberty to ſpeak, that impudence itſelf might not have the leaſt ſhadow of pretence. See a circumſtantial account of this memorable event, in the life of St. Cyril, by Butler.

That the Jews avoid inter-marriages with chriſtians is true, but whether from choice or neceſſity is doubtful: in chriſtian countries ſuch marriages are prohibited by law, and in all countries they are null of right. As to their rites and ceremonies, however majeſtic, whilſt the temple exiſted, ſince its deſtruction, they cannot be performed: theſe, therefore, cannot fix the attention of the Jews. Finally, whatever reaſons may be aſſigned for the continuation of the Jews, as a diſtinct people, the force of the prophecy is not the leſs invincible: becauſe to foreſee that theſe reaſons would be permanent, and the effect perpetually correſpondent, is beyond the ſphere of limited ſcience.

Let us now paſs from the Jews to the Gentiles: Chriſt

Chriſt ordered his Apoſtles to teach all nations, or, as it is in the Greek text, *to make them diſciples*—"*Matheleuſate*"—promiſing that he would be with them until the conſummation. Matt. ult. They immediately commenced the work, and carried his faith and name beyond the limits of the Roman Empire, into nations where the Roman name was not known: of this the monuments are univerſal, and the work as yet continues in the hands of their ſucceſſors. In this ſhort ſentence there is a promiſe which Omnipotence alone could fulfil, and a truth announced which God only could foreſee—that is, that Chriſt's miſſionaries would continue until the conſummation, and that they would form his diſciples in all nations. He was promiſed all nations as an inheritance, not all the men of all nations; if there be a nation, which was not yet enlightened by his goſpel, it will before the conſummation: the paſt enſures the future. Chriſt ſaid to his diſciples: "You will be brought before Kings and Governors for my ſake, in teſtimony to them, and to nations," Matt. x, 18. Impiety will not diſpute the accompliſhment of this prophecy. Chriſt, therefore, foreſaw that his diſciples would perſevere in the doctrine, which he taught in the face of perſecution, in defiance of deſpotic power. He alſo foreſaw that Kings and Governors would perſecute his diſciples: if he had conſulted the rules of probability, and offered a conjecture, he would have ſaid that Epicureans, whoſe principles are ſubverſive of order, and whoſe conduct ſets decency at defiance, or Peripatetics, who teach that prayers and ſacrifices are uſeleſs, would be arraigned before Kings and Governors; but that his diſciples, whom he ordered to be as harmleſs as doves, whoſe whole line of conduct, as preſcribed by him, and ſtrictly obſerved by them, breathed nothing but meekneſs, humility, ſubmiſſion, fidelity and obedience, to the ruling powers, ſhould be the objects of hatred,

of

of calumny and perſecution, is not matter of conjecture: there is but God, who knows the intenſe malignity of man, and the depravity of his heart, who could foreſee, that truth, innocence and juſtice, would be excluſively and univerſally the object of his hatred.

The writer adds one prediction more, againſt which even the effrontery of the modern ſcioliſt will not venture to ſtate an objection. When Mary, ſiſter to Lazarus, had poured the precious ointment on Chriſt's feet, and Judas expreſſed his indignation at, what his avarice called a profuſion, Chriſt ſaid: "Amen, I ſay unto you, whereſoever this goſpel is preached in the whole world, that alſo, which ſhe has done will be told in memory of her," Mat. xxvi, 13. John xii. In this ſhort ſentence there are two ſolemn promiſes: That the Goſpel would be preached all over the world; and that Mary's piety would be remembered in all places where the Goſpel is preached. Theſe promiſes, which nothing ſhort of Almighty power could fulfil, are ſo manifeſtly accompliſhed, that the obſtinacy of the modern Philoſophiſt is not more odious than contemptible.

If ſanctity, eſtabliſhed by miracles, authenticated by prophecy, confirmed by the accompliſhment of promiſes beyond the ſphere of limited power, ſpeak the divinity, the ſcriptures are divinely inſpired. In them are many things impervious to human reaſon; but there is nothing more reaſonable than to believe on the teſtimony of infallible authority, though reaſon from its limited nature cannot detect the principles, from which the propoſed truth reſults. Thus in human ſcience the Aſtronomer ſhews the denſity of the earth to be greater than that of the planet Jupiter. The principles from which he deduces this truth, though evident to the aſtronomer, are as impervious to the unlearned peaſant as any myſtery in religion.

The

The mathematician demonſtrates that the branches of the hyperbollic curve approach inceſſantly its aſſymptots, but can never touch them; this laſt propoſition, though mathematically true, has all the appearance of a contradiction; that God as far ſurpaſſes man in knowledge as the aſtronomer does the peaſant, is denied but by him, who does not believe a God to exiſt; that truths are known to him, of which man can form no idea is equally certain; to pretend that, he, who has enabled man by ſounds to convey his ideas to other men, or with his pen to paint them for future generations, cannot make himſelf underſtood, is an abſurdity which is refuted by contempt not by argument. As truth, is not oppoſite to truth, if we clearly conceive a truth, which we think oppoſite to revelation, we are not thence to conclude that there is any thing falſe in revelation, but that we have miſtaken the intended ſenſe of the inſpired writer; that the truth, which we think oppoſite to revelation is only oppoſite to that ſenſe, which we ourſelves affix to it. Thus we are frequently deceived, and yet more frequently in thinking that a manifeſt truth, in which there is a latent fallacy, which our reaſon cannot detect. Truths revealed by God are not ſubject to the examination of human reaſon; the proper uſe of reaſon is to inquire whether the propoſition propoſed he revealed by God or not; or whether it be propoſed in the ſenſe intended by the inſpired writer; but to inquire whether a propoſition revealed by God be true or falſe is a ſtretch of impudence, which no term in language can expreſs.

There are in the ſcriptures many truths revealed, which, though in appearance within the ſphere of human reaſon, have not been diſcovered by reaſon in its degraded ſtate: the unity of God, his immenſity, many of the divine perfections, which the chriſtian philoſopher

philoſopher, previouſly inſtructed by revelation, demonſtrates on ſound principles of reaſon without recourſe to religion. We do not find that the moſt intelligent amongſt the Heathens had a diſtinct idea of theſe perfections: their language is always obſcure, and ambiguous on the ſubject, and interſperſed with ridiculous errors.

The clemency of God, and his vigilant attention to the perfection of his creatures, is manifeſt in the relation of theſe very truths, which reaſon, unaſſiſted by a ſuperior light, might, perhaps, with great exertions, diſcover, and making them objects of faith; thus at once removing every ſhade of error, and illuſion, to which human reaſon is ſubject in the inveſtigation of truth. If truth were attainable but by demonſtration, many eſſential truths, or to ſpeak correctly, all truths, which have for their object the divine nature, or its perfections, would remain in total obſcurity amongſt the unlearned, who compoſe an incalculable majority of the human ſpecies: they do not underſtand the force of demonſtration, and even amongſt the learned, theſe truths would remain in a ſtate of uncertainty; however intelligent, and even unprejudiced they may be ſuppoſed, from the limitation of the human underſtanding, and the verſatility of the imagination, there is a character of uncertainty inſeparably annexed to it. A ſhade of error is latent in whatever is inveſtigated by human reaſon. Probable, or ſophiſtical reaſons, are miſtaken for demonſtration, and erroneous concluſions ſet in oppoſition to ſimple truth.

The irreconcileable differences and altercations of the Heathen philoſophers, and their deſcendants the modern ſquad, not only on abſtruſe, and difficult queſtions, but on firſt principles and intuitive truths, ſufficiently juſtify the obſervation.

If

If reaſon acting within its own ſphere, be an uncertain guide in abſtruſe inquiries, it muſt of neceſſity miſlead, if it tranſgreſſes the bounds, which God and nature have preſcribed. However in referring us to proper authority it ſeldom miſleads: thus reaſon tells us, that we muſt conſult witneſſes to be aſſured of the truth of facts; in like manner it hands us to revelation for truths, which God only knows, and makes known. Theſe divine perfections, which tranſcend human reaſon, the origin of the world, the creation of man, his primitive deſtination, tranſgreſſion and puniſhment, the incarnation of the divine wiſdom for his reconciliation, an event ſo remote from man's ideas, ſo far tranſcending his thoughts, that it never could have entered into his imagination, the divinity of which is manifeſt on the expoſition; theſe, and many other truths, intimately connected with our being, on which our happineſs eſſentially depend, are not ſubjects of metaphyſical diſquiſition: they are facts, and known, as all facts are, by teſtimony: in the ſcriptures we have the teſtimony of God, an unerring authority; to it reaſon muſt refer us.

The writers of the New Teſtament are Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, James and Jude. There is a difference in their ſtyle, but a perfect coincidence in the principal facts, which they relate, and in all the maxims of religion and morality, which they inculcate. The rage of modern ſcepticiſm, which ſubſtitutes ſuſpicions and ſurmiſes to proof, ſuſpects, or pretends to ſuſpect, that they were not the authors of the books aſcribed to them. This ſurmiſe is refuted by contempt. The works of Cæſar, of Curtius, of Terence, of Plautus, are believed authentic, without a contradiction, we do not diſpute the works of Collins, of Tindal, of Prieſtley, of Price, and to deſcend to the moſt ignorant

of

of ſcurrilous ſcribblers, we leave Tom Paine in peaceable poſſeſſion of his Age of Reaſon.

The Heathen writers againſt Chriſtianity admitted the books to have been written by the Evangeliſts, and Apoſtles, to whom they are aſcribed, nor did they deny abſolutely the miracles related in them: they endeavoured to elude the force of Chriſt's miracles, by aſcribing them to magic.

"Celſus," ſays Origen, Lib. 2, No. 48, "now very often, becauſe he could not deny the miracles which it is written that Chriſt performed, calumniates them as the effect of magical deluſions, we have often times ſhewn the contrary, now he aſks us why we judge him to be God, and he imputes to us this anſwer; becauſe he cured the lame and blind, to this adds, and becauſe, as you ſay, he raiſed the dead. That the lame and the blind were cured by Jeſus, that hence we believe him Son of God is manifeſt from this, that it is written in the prophecies: "then the eyes of the blind ſhall be opened, and the ears of the deaf ſhall hear, and the lame ſhall bound like the roe," Iſa. xxxv, 5.

Julian, the apoſtate, as cited by St. Cyril, Lib. 10, in prim. ſays: "neither Paul dared to call that Jeſus, God, nor Matthew, nor Luke, nor Mark; but the good man John, when he diſcovered that a great multitude, in moſt cities of Greece and Italy, were catched with that diſeaſe, and heard, I think privately, it is true; but yet he heard that the monuments of Peter and Paul were worſhipped, firſt dared to aſſert it."—That is, John firſt dared to ſay that Jeſus was God. The apoſtate, like our modern ſophiſts, contradicts himſelf: for if numbers were taken with that diſeaſe, as he calls it, in moſt cities of Greece and Italy, before John wrote, he could not have been the firſt to avow it.

From

From Celſus and Julian, the moſt irreconcileable enemies of the chriſtian name, we learn that the primitive chriſtians believed Chriſt to be God, and that a religious reſpect was paid to the relics of the ſaints. No heathen ever denied the Goſpels to have been written by the Evangeliſts, or that they were thought divinely inſpired, by Chriſtians. The firſt apologiſts of chriſtianity cited them inceſſantly without a contradiction; cotemporary writers cite the Goſpels, and aſcribe them to the Evangeliſts; Clement, in his epiſtle to the Corinthians; Polycarp, in his letter to the Philippians; Ignatius, in his ſeven epiſtles, which are confeſſedly genuine; Papias, as cited by Euſebius.

St. Irenæus, in his third book againſt hereſies, ſays: "Matthew, amongſt the Hebrews, wrote the Goſpel in their language, when Peter and Paul preached at Rome, and founded the Church. After their departure, Mark, who was Peter's diſciple, and interpreter, delivered to us in writing, what was taught by Peter. Luke, who was Paul's diſciple, wrote the Goſpel which was preached by him, and John, the diſciple of the Lord, who had leaned on his breaſt, wrote the Goſpel at Epheſus, in Aſia.

There were Goſpels ſuppoſed by impoſtors, whilſt ſome of the Apoſtles were yet living, but they were immediately rejected as ſpurious. An impoſition was impoſſible, becauſe the autographs of the Evangeliſts were in the hands of the Churches, which they had formed, and atteſted copies in the hands of all other Churches.

The immenſe number of authentic copies, and the care with which they were preſerved by the Church, at all times, ſhews the impoſſibility of ſuppoſition or interpolation, in every age of the Church ſince its firſt eſtabliſhment. On this principle Irenæus ſays:

" we know the diſpoſition of ſalvation but through thoſe, by whom the Goſpel came to us," and Clement, of Alexandria, Lib. 3, Stro. ſpeaking of ſome pretended Goſpel of the Egyptians, ſays ; " firſt we have not this ſaying in the four Goſpels, which are tranſmitted to us, but in that which is according to the Egyptians."

Tertullian, writing againſt Marcion, who admitted but the Goſpel of St. Luke, ſays, Lib. 4, Cap. 5 : the ſame authority of the Apoſtolical Churches authenticates the other Goſpels ; " it is by them, and through them, that we have the Goſpels, that is of John, of Matthew, that of Mark is ſaid to be of Peter, whoſe interpreter he was ; that digeſted by Luke, is uſually aſcribed to Paul." And in the 26th chapter of his Preſcriptions, he ſays that the autographs of the Apoſtles were yet in the hands of the Apoſtolical Churches : " Paſs through the Apoſtolical Churches where the Sees of the Apoſtles hold a Preſidency in their places, where their authentic letters are yet recited, ſounding their voice, and repreſenting the face of each of them. If Achaia be near, you have Phillippi, you have Theſſalonica. If you go to Aſia, you have Epheſus, if to Italy, you have Rome."

Origen, as cited by Euſebius, Lib. 6°, Hiſt. Eccl. cap. 25, ſays : " From tradition I have received four Goſpels, which are admitted by the univerſal church without a controverſy—the firſt was written by Matthew, formerly a publican, and afterwards an Apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, who wrote it in Hebrew, and publiſhed it to the Jews converted to the faith : the ſecond is that of Mark, who wrote as Peter had preached : and, for that reaſon, Peter, in his catholic epiſtle, acknowledges him as his ſon : ' The Church elect of God, which is in Babylon, ſalutes you, and my ſon Mark ;'

Mark ;' the third Goſpel is that of Luke, recommended by St. Paul, and written for the Gentiles ; the laſt is that of John."

And in his firſt homily, on St. Luke, he ſays, " that as there were ſome falſe prophets amongſt the Jews, ſo there were ſome pretended prophets amongſt Chriſtians." " Many," ſays he, " endeavoured to write Goſpels, but were not all received ; that you may know that, not only four Goſpels, but many have been written, from which the four, which we have, were ſelected and delivered to the Church."

Attend to St. Luke's preface, which is thus ſtated : " ſince many endeavoured to order a narration . . . . . as he ſays ' endeavoured,' it contains a latent accuſation againſt theſe, who undertook to write a Goſpel without a grace of the Holy Ghoſt. Matthew, Mark, John and Luke, did not endeavour to write, but, full of the Holy Ghoſt, they wrote the Goſpels. Many, therefore, *endeavoured* to form a narration of theſe things. The Church has four Goſpels, hereſy has many, of theſe, one is according to the Egyptians, another according to the twelve Apoſtles. Baſilides dared to write a Goſpel, and entitle it with his own name. Many endeavoured to write, and many endeavoured to form a narration, but four Goſpels are approved."

Euſebius, in the third book of his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, Ch. 24th, ſays : " of all the Diſciples of the Lord, Matthew and John alone left us written commentaries. It is ſaid that they were impelled to write by ſome neceſſity : for when Matthew had firſt preached the faith to the Hebrews, and was prepared to go from thence to other nations, he wrote his Goſpel in his country language, to ſupply by that inſtrument, which he left, what ſeemed wanting to his preſence. After this, when Mark and Luke had written

written their Goſpels ſeparately, it is ſaid, that John, who had hitherto preached by word only, betook himſelf to write. The three former Goſpels he is ſaid to have approved and confirmed by his teſtimony."

The hiſtorian aſſigns the reaſon, which induced John to write his Goſpel. It is perfectly conſiſtent with the author. He only relates ſome events, which they omitted, and omits ſome, which they related.

The Acts of the Apoſtles were written by St. Luke: they are addreſſed to Theophilus, as was the Goſpel, and by the ſame writer, and are of equal authority. They are cited by all early writers. St. Auſtin, in his Treatiſe on St. John, ſays: "that canonical book is to be read in the Church every year."

Our ſceptics complain of the ſtyle of the evangeliſts; that they did not obſerve the ſame order in their narration; that they cite paſſages from the old teſtament which are not to be found; thus Matthew ſays, ii, 23, "That might be fulfilled what was ſaid by the prophets, that he would be called a Nazarean;" and, xxvii, 9, he cites a paſſage from Jeremy, which was written by Zachary. They add, that the ſalutations, and ſome exhortations, in the epiſtles, do not ſavour of the gravity of an inſpired writer; for inſtance, Paul deſires Timothy to bring him a ſhort coat, ſome books and papers; they find other cauſes of ſuſpicion, which the writer paſſes unnoticed, as he finds them impertinent, tedious, irkſome, and beneath the notice of a ſerious man.

It has been already obſerved that the evangeliſts did not write for the amuſement of ſceptics, but for the inſtruction of chriſtians: their ſtyle is commenſurate, and perfectly well adapted to their purpoſe; if the

the order of time be neglected in their narration, it is becauſe it was not neceſſary to ſubſtantiate the facts which they relate, in theſe the coincidence is exact.

Matthew correctly cited the prophets: for the Meſſias is called *Netzer*, that is a Nazarean, by Iſaias, xi, 1. Or if Nazarean be underſtood to ſignify a perſon ſeparated and conſecrated to God. as was Samſon, to whoſe mother the Angel ſaid, that he would be "*Nazer Elohim*," conſecrated to God; Chriſt was ſo called by all the prophets.

The paſſage cited by Matthew is neither in Zachary or Jeremy—part of the paſſage is in one, and part in the other—the evangeliſt united them, citing the ſenſe not the ſound, as all good interpreters do. Thus Mark began his Goſpel citing from the prophet Iſaias, what is written partly by him and partly by Malachias; though it is extremely probable that the whole paſſage as cited by Matthew was formerly in the prophecy of Jeremy, but omitted, as were many other things, through the neglect of copyiſts.

It was not inconſiſtent with the gravity of the apoſtles to ſalute the perſons, to whom their letters were addreſſed, or others whoſe ſpiritual welfare they ſincerely deſired; an immediate inſpiration to every word in ſcripture was not neceſſary; a ſpecial aſſiſtance to prevent error in theſe things, which the apoſtles knew on the teſtimony of their ſenſes, was fully ſufficient.

The ſilence of heathen writers is the laſt refuge of our ſcioliſts. The cauſe is deſperate which ſeeks protection from a ſilent witneſs. The apologies for chriſtianity are yet in our hands, from theſe we know with what virulent animoſity the heathen philoſophers perſecuted the chriſtian name; if the facts ſtated by the chriſtian writers had not been incontrovertible, their adverſaries, poſſeſſed of every means of information,

formation, would have detected the ſhadow of impoſition, and undeceived the world, their ſilent acquieſcence is equivalent to a formal avowal.

Chalcidius, in his commentaries on the *timē* of Plato, ſpeaks of the ſtar which appeared to the wiſe men of Chaldea, and of their journey to Jeruſalem; and Macrobius, in the ſecond book of his Saturnalia, ſays: "that when Auguſtus heard that amongſt the children under two years old, whom Herod king of the Jews in Syria, ordered to be maſſacred, was one of his own ſons, he ſaid, it was better to be Herod's hog than his ſon." Macrobius relates this anecdote, as he does many others, from the works of Heathen writers, extant in his time, which have ſince been loſt.

The eclipſe, which happened at the death of Chriſt, in direct oppoſition to the eſtabliſhed order, as it was at the full moon, when an eclipſe of the ſun is naturally impoſſible, is thus deſcribed by Phlegon in the 13th book of his Chronicles, or Olympiads; "on the fourth year of the 202 Olympiad was a very great eclipſe, ſurpaſſing all which have happened: the day at the ſixth hour was turned into night, the ſtars were ſeen in the heavens, an earthquake threw down many houſes in Nice, a city of Bithynia." The ſame is repeated in the Chronicle of Euſebius and St. Jerom.

Exceptions have been taken againſt the teſtimonies of theſe Heathen writers, by Anti-Chriſtian Sophiſts of modern times. Theſe exceptions have been diſcuſſed and elucidated by men of ſcience, their futility, and the vanity of their inventors, expoſed to the contempt of the learned world: as they are only intended to divert the attention of the uninformed, from the more glaring abſurdities of our Epicureans, and to introduce obſcurity in a ſubject,

which

which is totally independent of the teſtimony of credulous Heathens, or incredulous Sophiſts, the writer paſſes them unnoticed.

Againſt Tertullian's appeal to the public records no exception can lie: "at the ſame inſtant," ſaid he, Ap. Ch. 1, No. 6, whilſt the ſun marked the midſt of its orbit, the day was withdrawn ..... This event, *(mundi caſum)* you have in the public archives."

Origen, in his ſecond book againſt Celſus, No. 83, ſays: "of the eclipſe, which happened under Tiberius Cæſar, in whoſe reign it is certain that Chriſt was crucified, and of the commotion, by which the earth was ſhook, I think Phlegon makes mention in the 13th or 14th book of his Chronicles."

Lucian, the martyr, a man well verſed in hiſtory, ſacred and profane, told his Judges with confidence: "conſult your annals, and you will find that in Pilate's time, when Chriſt ſuffered, the ſun fled at mid-day, and the day was interrupted." See Ruf. Lib. 9, Cap. 6°, Hiſt. Eccl.

The fact was indiſputable, known to the world, to friends and enemies, hence the apologiſts of Chriſtianity inceſſantly appealed to it, and without a contradiction.

We know that Chriſt foretold that his diſciples would be expoſed to ſufferings, and we know from Heathen writers, that this prediction was literally verified: Suetonius, in the life of Claudius, Ch. 15; Tacitus, in his annals, book 15; Pliny, the younger, in the 10th book of his epiſtles, Ch. 94, deſcribe, in part, the ſufferings of Chriſtians: if they had not, the perſecutions are of ſuch notoriety that even Atheiſtical effrontery does not diſpute them.

The teſtimony of theſe heathen philoſophers, who embraced the chriſtian faith, were its apologiſts, and its victims, is unexceptionable: men of ſenſe and ſcience,

ence, who renounce pleaſures and honors to profeſs a religion, which promiſes its votaries nothing but ſufferings and death in this world, muſt have irreſiſtible evidence of its truth.

Quadratus, a philoſopher converted by the Apoſtles, eſteemed and honored by the heathens as an ornament to the city of Athens, in the apology which he offered to the Roman Emperor Adrien, ſhews the difference between the miracles of Chriſt, and the deluſions of magicians: "the miracles of our Saviour," ſaid he, "were permanent, becauſe they were real and true—the ſick healed, and the dead raiſed, did not only appear reinſtated, but continued ſo, and that not only whilſt Chriſt remained on earth, but long after he had retired, ſo that ſome of them came down to our times." See Euſeb. Ecc. Hiſt. Lib. 4, Cap. 3; and St. Jerom, in Cato. 19, and Ep. 84.

Ariſtides, a platonic philoſopher, preſented an apology to the ſame Emperor. It was extant in St. Jerom's time and thought by him a maſter-piece of eloquence and erudition.

Theophilus, a man deeply verſed in all the ſcience of the heathen philoſophers, and in their different ſyſtems of mythology, as appears from his books to Autolycus, yet extant, vindicating the chriſtian religion from the calumnious invectives of his heathen friend, ſays: "Do not be incredulous, I did not believe the reſurrection of the dead formerly, but now I do, ſince I have more attentively conſidered the ſubject, after falling on the writings of the Holy Prophets, who foretold things now paſt as they have happened, things now preſent, as they do happen, and future events in the ſame order as they will happen." See B. 1, No. 14.

Athenagoras, alſo an Athenian philoſopher, wrote a defence of the reſurrection of the dead, a ſolid and methodical

methodical work; in it he ſolves all the difficulties which have been ſtated againſt that article of doctrine ſo mortifying to the ſons of pleaſure, ſo terrible to our epicurean ſceptics and ſciolists.

It is ſtated againſt the authority of St. Luke, that the enrolment of the people of the Roman Empire, which he mentions to have been ordered by Auguſtus, is not noticed by any heathen writer in the life of that Prince; nor does it appear that Cyrinus was then Preſident of Syria: to this the writer replies, that whether noticed by heathen writers or not, which he leaves to hiſtorians and chronologiſts to diſcuſs, it is not the leſs true that this enrolment was made by Cyrinus, who was, whether then, before or after, is uſeleſs to inquire, Preſident of Syria: for Joſephus ſays: Ant. Lib. 18, Cap. 1, No. 1, "In the mean time, Cyrinus, one of the Roman ſenators, ... came into Syria with a few ſoldiers, ſent by Cæſar to do juſtice to the people, and alſo that an enrolment of their poſſeſſions ſhould be made . . . though the Jews at firſt could not bear the name of enrolment, with patience, they, by little and little, ceaſed to give it any oppoſition." If it be true, as ſome modern chronologiſts, who agree in nothing but the phrenzy of contradicting antiquity, pretend, that Cyrinus was not yet appointed Governor, he muſt have been ſent by an extraordinary commiſſion, and it is unqueſtionably true, that he was Preſident of Syria, and dead ſome time before St. Luke wrote his Goſpel. The Evangeliſt did, therefore, with great propriety, call him *Preſident*. All writers deſignate a man by his moſt honorable title.

If St. Luke had been an impoſtor, he muſt have been ſenſeleſs to publiſh a ſuppoſed event of ſuch a public nature, that the impoſition muſt have been immediately detected, nor would the Jews have

omitted it. We find even Julian, the apoſtate, acknowledge it: "that Jeſus, ſays he, whom you preach was one of Cæſar's ſubjects, if you do not believe this, I will demonſtrate it: you ſay that he and his father and mother were enroled under Cyrinus." See Cyril, Lib. 6°.

The divine original of the ſcriptures eſtabliſhed beyond the poſſibility of a doubt, renders the Atheiſt, the Deiſt, the Sceptic, in a word, the whole tribe of modern anti-chriſtians, inexcuſable.

Whether they have been tranſmitted entire or interpolated; whether ſome entire books or parts of books have been ſuppoſed or not, is a queſtion which is not to be diſcuſſed with the Atheiſt or the Deiſt: for if it be true that any one book, or any one verſe of a book, be divinely inſpired; or that any one miracle has been wrought to authenticate revelation, the Atheiſt and Deiſt are defenceleſs.

To pretend that all the Scriptures have been loſt, or interpolated, through the neglect or malice of man, is to deny a Providence, and turn Atheiſt: however great the malice of man, or criminal his neglect, it can neither counteract the views of providence, nor render its cares ineffectual. To theſe cares the world was not more ſubject when God, in his mercy, enlightened it by a revelation of his divine will than ſince. The meaſures immediately adopted for the preſervation of the ſcriptures, and ſince purſued, rendered a material loſs, or interpolation, impoſſible: They were entruſted to a prieſthood divinely inſtituted, to men of ſenſe, of ſcience and influence, who were officially obliged to ſtudy them, and explain them to the people at large, in whoſe hands were numberleſs copies. This prieſthood, though confined to one tribe in the old law, is, in the new law, compoſed of men of ſcience promiſcuouſly taken from

from all the different tongues and nations of the world. Theſe, immediately on the eſtabliſhment of chriſtianity, poſſeſſed the ſcriptures, and continue to poſſeſs them, in the original languages, and in their different verſions. They are officially obliged to prevent interpolations or ſuppoſitions; if any ſuch be attempted, either through the malice of impoſtors, or the neglect of tranſcribers, it is immediately detected; its diſagreement with authentic copies proves it ſpurious, and it is of courſe rejected.

Many facts and circumſtances, intereſting at the time of their inſertion, have long ſince ceaſed to intereſt the world; theſe cannot be conſidered objects of providential protection, which does not extend to things abſolutely uſeleſs: it protects the fly while it exiſts, but not its memory. Such objects do not claim a ſtrict attention in tranſcribers: the names of perſons, of towns, of birds, of beaſts, of fiſhes, and many other things, which do not at all intereſt us, may be ſubject to alterations. The ſimilarity of ſome letters of the Hebrew alphabet, in which a difference is ſcarcely diſcernable, muſt have cauſed ſome changes, more particularly, in numbers expreſſed by theſe letters. Theſe being matters of indifference eaſily eſcape notice. In different verſions a difference is unavoidable, from the nature of the Hebrew language, which has no vowels: the maſſoretic points are of late invention. Affixing different points to the ſame conſonants, muſt give a different ſenſe. It is a peculiarity of this language, and its derivatives, that the ſame ſentence conveys many literal ſenſes equally true, and perhaps equally intended by the writer. But leading facts, ſpeculative doctrines, and moral maxims, are at all times equally intereſting, the objects of a protecting providence, commanding the attention of tranſcribers and readers, and are invariably the ſame.

The

The creation of the world, the prevarication of Adam, the deluge, the vocation of Abraham, the legation of Moſes, the miraculous paſſage through the Red Sea, the inſtitution of the Levitical prieſthood; the birth, miniſtry, miracles, the death, reſurrection, and aſcenſion of Jeſus Chriſt, the great maxims of his morality, the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt, the miſſion of the apoſtles, their ſucceſs in eſtabliſhing chriſtianity according to Chriſt's promiſe. Theſe, and many other facts, are deſcribed in the ſame manner in originals, verſions, tranſcripts, in a word in all languages, to make any alteration in theſe is not, nor was not, at any time, within the range of human power.

The writer here diſmiſſes the Atheiſt, the Deiſt, the modern Scioliſt, the whole ſquad of Anti-Chriſtian ſcribblers from his mind and his paper, without even a diſtant hope of their converſion. "The fool ſaid in his heart there is no God." This language was ſpoken in David's time; the fool continues to ſpeak the ſame language ſtill, and will whilſt the world continues. All reaſoning is loſt on the wretch whom God deſpiſes; "ſpeak not, ſays the wiſe man, in the ears of fools, they will deſpiſe the inſtruction," Pro. xxiii. 9.

F. B. V. G. Que.

REMARKS

ON A PAMPHLET

ENTITLED

POPERY CONDEMNED

BY

Scripture and the Fathers.

Eſtai gar kairos óte tēs ugiainousēs didaſkalias ouk anexontai. Alla kata tas epithumias tas idias, éautois episōreuſoúſi didaſkalous knēthomenoi tên akouén," 2nd. Tim. iv. 3.

For there will be a time when they will not endure ſound doctrine, but according to their ſenſual deſires will heap to themſelves teachers with itching ears.

HALIFAX:

PRINTED BY HOWE AND SON,

1809.

INTRODUCTION.

IN excuſe for the notice, which the writer has been induced to take of a compilation deſerving of none, he offers the reaſons aſſigned by St. Jerom, in his work againſt Helvidius: "I was preſſed, ſays Jerom, by the brethren to make a reply to a Pamphlet by a certain Helvidius. I delayed for ſome time, not that it was difficult to refute, a meer country clown, who ſcarcely knows the firſt rudiments of literature, but I feared leſt by making a reply that ſcribbler might appear deſerving of notice. I alſo feared leſt a turbulent fellow, who is in the whole world, alone both prieſt and layman, and who thinks clamour eloquence; and to calumniate all others proof of a good conſcience, finding a ſubject of diſpute would begin to blaſpheme, and from his elevated place would paſs ſentence on the world: I had alſo to fear for myſelf from his ſcurrilous invectives; though theſe were juſt reaſons of paſſing his pamphlet in ſilence, a more cogent reaſon has forced a reply, that is, to prevent the impreſſions which his frenzy may make:" theſe reaſons which juſtified a reply to Helvidius will juſtify this work; in it there are ſome ſtrictures intentionally ſevere in order to cure, if poſſible, that itch of abuſing papiſts, with which the *author of Popery Condemned* is tormented, as phyſicians try the efficacy of a doubtful medicine on a worthleſs ſubject, or to ſpeak their language *faciunt experimentum ſuper vile caput*, if they have not the deſired effect on him, they may on others.

A PAMPHLET of uncommon bulk, entitled, *Popery condemned by Scripture and the Fathers*, has been lately imported from Edinburgh, whether the offspring of fancy there, or the genuine fœtus of the ſuppoſed Author's imagination here, is uſeleſs to inquire: Men's opinions, not their names, are the proper ſubjects of diſcuſſion. The frontiſpiece is embelliſhed with a quotation from Shakeſpear, a father of irreſiſtible authority on the Stage, to him ſucceeds Hudibras, the Idol of independants, and in the courſe of the work d'Alembert, of atheiſtical memory. Popery is an univerſal theme: "the abuſe of Popery, ſays a late Writer, is that happy incident, which illumines the evidences of the Hiſtorian, gives energy to the eloquence of the Rhetorician, adorns eſſays, travels, geographies, poems, pamphlets and romances; it gives wit to dulneſs, ſenſe to nonſenſe, truth to lies; and, what is its main advantage, (ſuch is the public taſte) it enſures praiſe, credit, and, better far than either, ... money to the hero, who employs it moſt profuſely." How many ranting enthuſiaſts, from John Bunyan, down to the author of Popery Condemned, would have deſcended to the ſhades unknown, and unlamented, if zeal for the deſtruction of Popery had not given celebrity to their names? How many enlightened prophets, ſince Martin of paradoxical memory's days, have not only foretold, but preciſely determined, the time of the downfall of Popery? How many apoſtolical pedlars, pipers, coblers, &c. have piouſly raiſed their paſtoral voices againſt the abominations of Popery? Yet, ſtrange to tell, Popery ſubſiſts undiminiſhed and unchanged. Why this inſuperable obſtinacy in Papiſts? They reply, that all this abuſe, which is laviſhed on Popery, all this noiſy nonſenſe, all theſe wild declamations againſt its corruptions, are levelled againſt a phantom, which exiſts but in the artifices of deception and intereſt, or in the illuſion of prejudice

and

and ſimplicity. The enthuſiaſt, whoſe reſtleſs mind is always in ſearch of ſome new object, ſees, within his diſturbed imagination, a hideous figure, which he calls Popery, this figure his fancy clothes, and on it he vents his ſpleen. Intereſt pretends to believe, ſimplicity or prejudice believes him infallible. Though Papiſts have not employed him to compoſe their creed, nor do they take his fancy for a rule of faith, he whines moſt piteouſly if they refuſe to acknowledge this popery, of his invention, to be the ſtandard of their belief: theſe ridiculous efforts to perſuade them that what they do not believe is a part of their creed, excite only a ſmile of contempt, or an emotion of pity. When they hear a teacher in one of the modern ſchools boldly aſſert that *fornication is authoriſed by the Church of Rome*,* and that *diſpenſations are granted to commit the baſeſt of crimes*,† they conclude without heſitation that he is groſsly deceived, or that he intentionally and malicioufly deceives; if deceived, they lament his folly; if a deceiver they deſpiſe his malice: whether deceived or a deceiver he loſes all credit, and racks his imagination in vain for reaſons to juſtify what the moſt ignorant Papiſt knows to be a notorious falſehood.

This Reverend Paſtor of ſome Church, its deſcriptive title he himſelf, perhaps, may know, as it is of the lateſt date, neweſt taſte, and fineſt poliſh, it is rather unfortunate that it is not univerſally known, leſs, in the true ſpirit of new modelled charity, given ſome *wholeſome caſtigation* to an anonymous writer, who publiſhed Remarks on Doctor Stanſer's Examination of the Reverend Edmund Burke's Letter of Inſtruction. This caſtigation conſiſts of ſtrictures inceſſantly made on the vanity and ignorance of that writer. To which he modeſtly replies: that an accuſation of vanity is ſeldom brought againſt an anonymous writer. Other motives may be aſſigned; but vanity can have no ſhare in an anonymous work. To this he adds that, if to a rahpſody compoſed

* Popery Con. p. 206 † p. 240

compoſed of fragments collected from different authors, as judiciouſly aſſorted as the borrowed feathers on Æſop's crow, interſperſed with coarſe invectives, and thus ſwelled into a volume, he had ſet his name, and informed the world by an advertiſement in a public gazette, his vanity would have been a fit ſubject of ſarcaſtic ridicule. As to his ignorance, he has been repeatedly told of it by all theſe Reverend Gentlemen, who have condeſcended to honor him with their animadverſions; he knows it; he acknowledges it; it is his misfortune, not his fault. He naturally expected information from the extraordinary talents, and profound erudition of theſe Reverend Gentlemen; but has yet to lament a cruel diſappointment; even the tranſcendental genius of the author of Popery Condemned, and the refulgence of his wit have not diſpelled the clouds; from ſome unlucky defect in his underſtanding, or native dulneſs of apprehenſion, no doubt, he fancies that he ſees in that wonderful performance, *Popery Condemned*, but a thick veil of artifice, concealing an unbounded fund of ignorance, ſome ridiculous attempts at wit, and vain efforts, not to invalidate cloſe reaſoning by argument, but to divert the attention of his readers from the ſubject under diſcuſſion to the immorality of Popes and Monks of whom he ſeems to know nothing, or to the exceſſes of the catholic clergy, of whom, perhaps, he does not know an individual. His powers of divination are aſtoniſhingly great: from them he has learnt, that the writer thinks the vileſt calumnies laudable when they tend to ſupport the Popiſh ſyſtem.* This ſpirit of divination at times deceives weak mortals: it has doubly deceived our pious caſtigator: it has induced him to act literally on the principle, which he falſely and injudiciouſly aſcribes to the writer: as proof of his aſſertion the caſtigator quotes from Mr. Burke's Letter of Inſtruction this paſſage: "I paſs in ſilence other party writers not leſs virulent than he, (Sir Richard Muſgrave)

* Pref. p. vi.

Muſgrave) holding it unfair and inconſiſtent with the morality of the goſpel to *traduce* before the public any man, much more ſo, any body of men, but in the caſe of ſelf defence." To this paſſage the caſtigator pretends to affix a ſenſe which was not intended by Mr. Burke, and which the paſſage cannot bear. The firſt and moſt genuine ſenſe of the verb *traduce*, is to cenſure, if we believe Johnſon, that, in that ſenſe, and no other, it muſt be underſtood, is manifeſt from the ſubject matter, and context. Mr. Burke aſſigns the reaſon why he ſo ſeverely cenſures Sir Richard Muſgrave's compilation, not why he calumniates the man: the ſuppoſition is ridiculous, and the imputation as foul a calumny as any one of the many, which ornament *Popery Condemned.* That Mr. Burke's cenſure on Sir Richard's compilation was neither inconſiderate, nor undeſerved, the writer has ſhewn to demonſtration in his reply to Doctor Cochran's fifth letter: ſee Review, p. 113 ..... If the caſtigator had read that reply, which he pretends to refute, he would have ſeen the epithets, applied to his favourite Luther, juſtified by unqueſtionable facts. The writer preſumes to adviſe him to read the work, which he may be tempted to refute in future, if the author be living, and not wholly to confide in his ſpirit of divination, both for the contents of the work, and the refutation of it. Our Caſtigator appeals to Eraſmus, who ſays: "that Luther had two faults: he touched the Monks bellies, and the Pope's crown;" but he has forgotten to inform his readers that there were ſeveral ſtages in Luther's life: that he gradually aſcended from the obſcurity of the Auguſtinian convent to the reſplendent throne of Patriarch, or Pope, of the new modelled church. His firſt eſſay, whilſt yet a Monk in his frock and ſandals, was againſt abuſes, which did exiſt, if there be truth in hiſtory; and of the exiſtence of which, the pretended reformation is itſelf the moſt deciſive evidence. Againſt them abuſes others declaimed as well as Luther, far more vehemently than Eraſmus himſelf. If Luther had confined his ſtrictures

tures to the exiſting abuſes, however ſevere they might have appeared to diſpaſſionate, and unprejudiced men, or even extraordinary in a ſimple Monk, whoſe duty it was to correct himſelf, and leave the correction of others to their lawful ſuperiors, he would have retained a ſhare in Eraſmus's eſteem.

This reforming Patriarch, knowing how great an acquiſition a man ſo univerſally eſteemed as Eraſmus would have been to his party, if it were poſſible to ſeduce him, directed Melancton to write to him, on the ſubject. This letter produced no effect. Luther then wrote himſelf an epiſtle full of the moſt fulſome flattery. Eraſmus politely replied in his letter, yet extant; he gave Luther ſome prudent and charitable admonition; never to ſpeak in the pulpit againſt the perſons or powers of Popes or Princes, but ſolely againſt thoſe, who abuſe their confidence; to ſay nothing with arrogance, or the ſpirit of party; not to permit himſelf to be ſwayed by anger, hatred, vain glory, or any other paſſion, though he might conceal it under the maſk of piety, which would only make the matter worſe.* He knew the man though he had not ſeen him; but when he ſaw Luther diſregard all reſtraints, and tranſgreſs the bounds of public decency, he changed his opinion and his language. In a letter to Melancton, he ſays of Luther: "what ſhocks me is, that in every thing which he undertakes to ſupport, he goes to extremities, even to exceſs; if he be admoniſhed, ſo far from moderating himſelf, he goes yet farther. He ſeems to have no deſign but to paſs to yet greater exceſſes. I know his humour by his writings as well as if I lived with him. He is a fiery impetuous man. You ſee in him an Achilles, whoſe rage is invincible." Melancton himſelf, though Luther's greateſt admirer, made heavy complaints of his diſciples—in a letter to Eraſmus he ſays: "there are ſome amongſt them, who have forgotten humility and religion, who excite troubles by their ſeditious preaching, who obſerve none of the rules of civil life, who

* Inter. Ep. Er. Lib. 6. Ep. 4.

who only endeavour to eſtabliſh their own tyranny" . . . To this Eraſmus replies: that Luther inverts all order, pretending to correct abuſes he cauſes yet greater evils, by exciting commotions and ſedition. "Is it", ſays he, "conſiſtent with chriſtian piety to preach to the people that the Pope is Anti-Chriſt; that Biſhops and Prieſts are but ſhadows, that human conſtitutions are hereſies; that confeſſion is a peſtilence; that to ſpeak of good works, of merits or efforts, is to be an heretic, to aſſert that there is no free will, that all things happen by unavoidable neceſſity; that it is no matter of what nature our works be." Finally, concludes Eraſmus, "the goſpel formerly made men better, this new goſpel only ſerves to corrupt them."* Luther's doctrine, ſubverſive of order and deſtructive of morality, Eraſmus refutes in a Latin work, entitled, *Diatribe de libero arbitrio contra Lutherum* or *a diſſertation on free will againſt Luther.* In this work Eraſmus ſhews, in a maſterly manner both from reaſon and revelation, that man is poſſeſſed of free will, however weakened by the ſin of Adam; he replies to all Luther's objections, and demonſtrates that all the paſſages in Scripture, which eſtabliſh the neceſſity of divine grace, prove the exiſtence of free will, becauſe they ſuppoſe that grace ſtrengthens the will, aſſiſts the will, and acts with the will, whence it follows of all neceſſity that the will itſelf muſt act. This work, though a peremptory refutation of Luther's new doctrines, was diſregarded by him whilſt it was confined to the Latin Edition, becauſe the Germans whom he and his emiſſaries had ſeduced by flattering their paſſions did not underſtand that language, but when *Emſer* and *Cochley* had tranſlated it into the German Language, his indignation knew no bounds. The very name of Eraſmus was terrible to him; and to ſupport ſome ridiculous errors againſt a man ſo far his ſuperior, writing in defence of truth, was a taſk which alarmed even Luther's effrontery. However, ſomething muſt be done. He reluctantly

* Inter. Ep. Er. Lib. 19. Ep. 3.

tantly undertakes it ; but in terms ſo unmeaſured, and in a ſtyle ſo envenomed, that Melancton ſaid : " would to God Luther had been ſilent, I thought age would have made him moderate, but I ſee that he grows more violent every day." Eraſmus piqued at the torrent of unexpected and undeſerved abuſe which was laviſhed on him, immediately replied in two books, which he entitled ' *Hyperaſpiſtes' the protector*, or a defence of the diſſertation. In his reply he reproaches Luther with having filled his pretended refutation with uſeleſs tales, common places, ſophiſms, coarſe language, figures improperly applied and advanced without ſhame. It ſeems to have ſerved as a model to our caſtigator. " I am ſurpriſed" ſays Eraſmus to Luther, " that you confine yourſelf to my treatiſe, which contains nothing but what is moderate, whilſt you have ſo many enemies, who fall on you and ſpare you much leſs than I have done. Near you, is *Emſer*, and far from you is *Cochley*, in England a biſhop, who overwhelms you with volumes, in France *Clichtoveus*, and Langelius in Italy : there are ſome of your own ſect, who give you exerciſe enough : a *Zuinglius* who combats your opinion on the Euchariſt, a *Capiton*, on Pecolompadius, &c. is it not aſtoniſhing that you obſerve a profound ſilence with reſpect to them all, and fix on me :" to the *Defence of the Diſſertation*, Luther made no reply. In his pretended refutation of the diſſertation he had advanced the moſt horrid and diſguſting blaſphemy : that God is the author of all crimes ; that free will is a vain title ; that God effects in us evil as well as good ; that the great perfection of faith is to believe that God is juſt though he makes us damnable by his abſolute will ; that he ſeems to take a pleaſure in the torments of the unhappy ; God, ſaid he, pleaſes you when he crowns the unworthy, he ought not to diſpleaſe you when he damns the innocent : ſee Review, p. 130 . . . . .

Eraſmus's averſion to Luther, and his goſpellers, encreaſed in proportion as he remarked the progreſs of the ſect, and the devaſtation, which it cauſed : " this new goſpel,

goſpel," ſaid he, in a letter to a phyſician, "has produced a new ſort of people, obſtinate, impudent, hypocrites, calumniators, liars, deceivers, who do not agree amongſt themſelves, and are troubleſome to others, ſeditious, furious, full of chicane, they diſpleaſe me ſo that if I knew a town, in which there is not one of them, I would fix my dwelling there." Of the many able writers, who, at that unlucky period, oppoſed the intruſion of Luther's errors, and expoſed the abſurdity of his paradoxes, for opinions they cannot be called, few, if any, more effectually checked their progreſs than Eraſmus, whom our caſtigator cites as one of the fathers for the condemnation of Popery. But Eraſmus ſaid that Luther had two faults: that he touched the Monks' bellies, and the Pope's crown. True, but Luther had only commenced his career. Eraſmus was undeceived, and we have ſeen what he thought of that furious Monk's wild declamation againſt Popes and Princes. Let us now diſcuſs his ſtricture on the Monks' bellies. It is ſtrictly true, as Eraſmus remarks, that Luther's firſt preaching did alarm the Monks; but our caſtigator, whoſe memory deceives him at times, as well as his ſpirit of divination, has forgotten to inform his readers that theſe Monks, who were alarmed at Luther's preaching, were yet Monks, or rather Epicureans under the cowl of Monks, ſubject to certain rules and reſtraints, which they ought to obſerve, but did not. The idea of a reformation to ſuch men muſt be alarming, it was particularly ſo at that time as their diſorders and exceſſes were public, offenſive, and even diſguſting, and a reformation of courſe was loudly called for; but a reformation of conduct and morals, a reformation of exceſſes and intemperance, a reformation of diſſipation and ſenſuality, was the reformation expected by all pious chriſtians; a reformation, which would have re-eſtabliſhed order, and diſcipline, and would have enforced the obſervance of monaſtic rules and regulations. It is not ſurpriſing that the firſt rumour of ſuch a reformation

ſhould

should alarm these epicurean Monks; but when they found that Luther's reformation was as opposite to this as darkness is to light; that it consisted in a release from all civil and religious restraints; that it cancelled all vows, promises and obligations; that it extinguished every idea of self-denial or mortification; that it suppressed all fasts and abstinences, all rules and regulations, and consequently enabled its professors to gratify the cravings of the belly to their utmost extent, these Monks were amongst the first to embrace it; they became not only his proselytes but his most zealous assistants in the glorious work of reforming. Hence in many parts of Germany, where the disorders were greatest, and ignorance most profound, we find convents and monasteries almost instantaneously depopulated, and these licentious Monks becoming the first Pastors of all the reformed churches in Germany.

If our castigator be a Pastor of any of these churches, whatever its descriptive title be, he must date from one of these Monks, whose bellies were alarmed by Luther's first preaching; and, whatever reluctance he may feel, he must acknowledge him for his ancestor: Because the fact is incontrovertible: the first Pastors of the reformed churches did not fall from the clouds, nor grow like mushrooms, they were the Priests and Monks then in being, who abjured the faith, which they had professed until that unlucky period, and embraced the reformed faith. Of all historical facts there is not one more certain than this. It is known to every man who reads the history of our times. Burnet informs us, that, when the Commissioners, in 1559, made a report of the success of their visitation to Queen Elizabeth, the whole kingdom had received the orders of Parliament, and the Queen's *Pastoral Instructions*, with due submission; that though there were 9,400 benefices in England, they all embraced the reformation, with the exception of 14 bishops, 6 deans, 12 arch-deacons, 15 principals of colleges, 50 canons, and 80 vicars. In the

ſpace of about thirty years theſe men had changed their religion four ſeveral times, in obedience to the injunctions of their kings and queens. Such were the firſt Paſtors of the reformed churches in the United Kingdom, and if they were guilty of the exceſſes and cruelties with which this caſtigator charges them, which, by the bye the writer does not believe, it is not diſhonorable to catholics, who diſclaim them, but to proteſtants, who muſt acknowledge them for their anceſtors.

The writer, in his remarks on Doctor Stanſer's Examination, had ſpoken irreverently of Cromwell, Henry the Eighth's vicar general; he had even preſumed to cenſure that *worthy nobleman* ſeverely. This has inflamed the caſtigator's bile beyond its uſual pitch; but has he forgotten, or did he ever know, that the Britiſh parliament ſtigmatiſed that vile ſycophant with the moſt opprobrious epithet in the Engliſh language: *a traitor to the State*? and as ſuch condemned him to loſe his head? He ſeems to know nothing of the man's hiſtory. The writer gives a ſketch of it in a few words: he was born in Pulteney, bound apprentice to a ſhearman, fled from his maſter, enliſted a private ſoldier, ſo ignorant that he never obtained the rank of corporal, was in the ranks when the Duke of Bourbon traiterouſly ſtormed Rome, in 1527, ſhared in the maſſacre and the barbarities committed on that memorable occaſion, a recital of which chills the blood; they diſgrace the annals of mankind; he returned to England, engaged as a menial ſervant in Woolſey's family; inſinuated himſelf into the good graces of that intriguing prelate; was recommended to Henry VIII. ſerved him in his pleaſures; by the influence of Anne Boulen was raiſed to the dignity of Baron of Oakham, Earl of Oxford, prime miniſter in ſtate affairs, and vicar-general in ſpirituals; in that quality he preſided over the Engliſh clergy; ſubſcribed, and pretended to believe, all the articles of Henry's creed, though he ſecretly profeſſed the doctrines of Zuinglius; he adviſed the ſuppreſſion of monaſteries, and the ſale of church lands at a

low

low rate, to engage the nobility and gentry in the support of Henry's supremacy; in conjunction with Cranmer, who, like Cromwell, publicly professed, and swore to the truth of Henry's articles, which he probably disbelieved; he had views for the advancement of the reformation. It is true, Cranmer was more interested, because he was obliged not only to conceal his faith but his wife. Cromwell knowing that Henry refused nothing to a wife whilst she managed to command his affections, thought Anne of Cleves well qualified to advance his views; but, unfortunately for him, Henry transferred his affections to Catharine Howard; employed Cranmer, a ready instrument on such occasions, to annul his marriage with Anne of Cleves; turned his indignation against Cromwell, who advised the marriage; soon found means of disposing of that favourite: it was suspected that he secretly encouraged the new preachers against the six articles of Henry's fabrication; some indiscreet expressions against the King were reported, an order issued, parliament convened, condemned him as a traitor to the state. It was remarked that he was condemned unheard, in conformity with the advice which he had given to condemn the accused without a hearing. Thus perished our castigator's *worthy nobleman.** The writer begs leave to assure him, that to serve the intrigues of a Woolsey, a Cranmer or an Anne Boulen; to minister to the pleasures or the rapacity of an Henry the eighth, is a sort of merit of which he is not ambitious, that nature has not blessed him with the duplicity, the pliability of conscience, the cringing servility which so eminently distinguish this *worthy nobleman.* He neither expects applause, nor fears animadversion for such merit; he has the honor to date his pedigree from honest men, who sacrificed not only their possessions, but their hopes in this world, in defence of what they believed to be truth, the only inheritance which they have left him, for which he most sincerely thanks them.

The

*Pre. p. viii.

The writer in his remarks on Dr. Stanſer's Exam. ſtated facts collected from Proteſtant writers, and related in their own words. See Rem. p. 8. . . . . Theſe our caſtigator modeſtly enough calls *calumnies*, without even an attempt to invalidate or elude the force of the authorities, which ſubſtantiate them. Immediately after he tells us, that there are "many Romiſh clergymen who deplore the general depravity of that church, and abominate the ſelfiſh ſpirit of their brethren." A material queſtion preſents itſelf: how does he know it? The man, in all appearance, does not know an individual of that immenſe body of men, conſiſting of ſome millions, ſpread over the chriſtian world, whom he thus aſperſes in bulk. The Romiſh clergy do not ſay that the miniſters of the reformed churches are depraved. Why ſo? Becauſe they do not know it. They do not conſult the ſpirit of divination, the caſtigator's inſtructor; they know it to be a ſpirit of illuſion, a lying ſpirit, and diſregard its ſuggeſtions. He even condeſcends to admit that there are "ſome of the Romiſh clergy who cheriſh a high eſteem for the ſcriptures." Does he know any one of them who does not? Such a clergyman would be a phenomenon as rare as the Phœnix of the Ancients. Their reſpect and reverence for the ſcriptures is ſuch, that they will not permit every pedant, who underſtands a few words of Greek and Hebrew, to tranſlate them according to his own fancy; nor will they permit either enthuſiaſts, or impoſtors, to affix to them a ſenſe of their own invention, as our caſtigator has done, more than once, in his pretended refutation: cloſing the work he gives a remarkable inſtance of his ingenuity in forcing the ſcriptures to ſpeak his own language. "What agreement hath the temple of God with *images*," in the text, *with idols*, *meta eidŏloōn*. Again: "Little children keep yourſelves *from images*;" in the text, *from idols*. *Apo tŏn eidolōn*. The Greek word *eikōn*, ſignifies an image from *eik I am like*, the term *eidolon*, ſignifies an *idol*, from *eidos a form*. This every man knows who knows any thing

thing of that language : the inſpired writers, ſpeaking of images, invariably expreſs them by the different inflexions of *eikon* : Thus Matt. xxii. 20. whoſe image is this? *tinos è eikōn autè* . . . 1ſt Cor. xi. 7—for the man ought not to cover his head, being the image and glory of God. *Eikon kai doxa.* If, in complaiſance to the caſtigator, the apoſtle had ſubſtituted *eidōlon* to *eikon*, he would have made man the *idol* of God. The writer does not remember to have ſeen ſo impudent a perverſion of the ſcriptures, manifeſtly intended to miſlead the ignorant. Catholics have a fixed ſtandard : the ſcriptures depoſited in the hands of the firſt paſtors of the church, by the apoſtles, and from them deſcending in regular ſucceſſion to the paſtors of the preſent day, not the ſcriptures reformed, and refitted by every enthuſiaſt, or impoſtor, to his own opinions, which he gives to his deluded followers as the pure Word of God.

From the title page of *Popery Condemned*, a refutation, or ſomething like a refutation of the writer's *Remarks on Doctor Stanſer's Examination*, &c. might be expected, but the caſtigator found it more convenient to overlook the *errors and falſehoods contained in them*, and direct the *attention of his readers to the leading points of debate between proteſtants and papiſts* * Why not tell his readers that theſe *errors and falſehoods* are harmleſs ? Or, that a ſerious refutation of *errors and falſehoods* which have all the appearance of truth, and are ſupported by a train of concluſive reaſoning, is an alarming taſk to any man, an inſuperable difficulty to a man, who has not ſtudied dialectics ? That a few tales of Popes and Monks, reſembling theſe of Robinſon Cruſoe, and as well authenticated, are more amuſing, and as much to his purpoſe ? It is true papiſts diſregard theſe tales ; they tell him, that ſuch tales, ſo far from being leading points of debate between proteſtants and papiſts, are not points of debate at all ; that their truth or falſehood is perfectly indifferent ; that to amuſe his readers with ſuch tales

*Pre. p. 4.

tales is a pitiful ſubterfuge, which ſhews that he has no ſolid reaſon to offer, either in defence of his own opinions, or in oppoſition to the doctrine, which he pretends to refute.

After a preface of nine or ten pages, in which he profuſely laviſhes his modeſt animadverſions on the *vanity*, the *ignorance*, the *calumnies*, the *errors* and *falſehoods* of the writer, this caſtigator proceeds at length to diſcuſs the *extraordinary claims* of the See of Rome. It is rather ominous that his firſt line ſhould contain a palpable miſtake: they are not the *extraordinary* but the *ordinary* claims of that See, which form the ſubject of debate between proteſtants and papiſts. The caſtigator does not ſeem to underſtand the ſtate of the queſtion. The writer had ſaid, in his remarks on Dr. Stanſer's Examination, that "there is as great a certainty of Peter's having been at Rome as that he wrote his firſt and ſecond Epiſtle." This gives great offence to the caſtigator. The writer, without heſitation repeats the aſſertion, and ſubjoins a peremptory reaſon: that Peter was at Rome, and that he wrote his firſt and ſecond epiſtle, are facts, the certainty of which reſts on the ſame authority, the uninterrupted tradition of ages; the facts are therefore equally certain. The man has a weak head, or a bad heart, who denies it. Imagination perhaps may ſuggeſt ſome ſilly reaſons to elude the force of this reaſoning, but not one to diſprove it. In the ſame paragraph the caſtigator either intentionally miſtakes, or groſsly blunders: "The certainty of this fact," he ſays, "does not, as the writer imagines, prove ruinous to the reformed ſyſtem." The writer imagines no ſuch thing. The certainty of Peter's having been at Rome, or Jeruſalem, or Antioch, or elſewhere, is not the fact, which the writer ſtated as ruinous of the reformed ſyſtem, but *the certainty of Peter's having founded his See at Rome, and tranſmitted his authority to feed Chriſt's flock to his ſucceſſor.* See Remarks, p. 176. The reaſons there adduced to authenticate the fact, are yet without a refutation. Idle tales do not invalidate

poſitive

positive facts ; and this fact is confessedly ruinous of the reformed system : for if it be true, that Peter did transmit to his successor, his authority to feed Christ's flock, they are not his flock who disclaim this authority : under pretence of directing his reader's attention to the leading subject of debate, the castigator introduces a tale of Peter's going to Rome to resist the juggling tricks of Simon the magician, and of a chair being reverenced there on the 18th of January, on which the labours of Hercules were discovered in 1662. It is doubtful, whether ignorance or artifice be the more prominent feature of this ridiculous tale. The chair which is reverenced on the 18th of January, is a festival in commemoration of the foundation of the Apostolical See, in Latin called *Cathedra*, which has no reference to chairs or tables ; there is another festival in commemoration of St. Peter's chair at Antioch, on the 22d of Feb. See the Roman calendar. Thus ignorance and artifice combined sport with the credulity of a deluded people, whose pride is flattered in being taught to believe that they themselves are the only competent judges, of what they do not understand.

In every age of the church there have been, and there yet are christians, who celebrate the anniversary of their baptism, in gratitude to the divine goodness for their adoption, and if these new modelled christians do not, it is because they have wandered so far from the old path, and so deeply bewildered themselves in the labyrinth of fancy, that they have not only lost sight of the true path but of all the land marks which distinguish it. We know that a festival in commemoration of St. Peter's chair, or the exaltation of that apostle to the supreme government of the Christian church, was celebrated before St. Austin's days : we have yet extant a sermon preached by that prelate on the subject, in which he says : " the institution of this day's solemnity has received from the Ancients the name of *cathedra*, or *chair*, because Peter, first of the apostles, is said this day to have

have received the chair of the bishopric. Justly therefore the churches celebrate the anniversary *(natalem)* of that seat, which the apostle received for the salvation of churches, the Lord saying: "Thou art Peter, *(a rock)* and on this rock I will build my church." The Lord therefore called Peter the foundation of the church, and therefore the church rightly honors *(colit)* this foundation, on which the heighth of the ecclesiastical edifice rises.* We have also a sermon of Leo the Great on the same subject, in which he says, that we ought to celebrate the festival of St Peter's chair, as joyfully as the festival of his martyrdom; for says he, "as by the one he was exalted to a throne of glory in the heavens, so by the other he was instituted head of the church on earth" We have yet extant four sermons preached on the anniversary of his accession, to the dignity of the apostolical see, by this pontiff, in whose days Antichrist had not yet made his appearance in Rome, if we believe protestant writers. Even the castigator fixes his coming after the death of Gregory the Great, who was the twentieth Pope in succession to Leo, a most unlucky mistake, which has involved reformed controvertists in difficulties from which there is no evasion. Why so? Because this pontiff, in his works, universally acknowledged genuine, teaches all these doctrines, which the reformed churches reject, and pretend to be the inventions of Antichrist: the real presence of the body of Christ in the eucharist, see Review, p. 231; the public sacrifice, and the benediction of the chrism. (1) In that letter he complains that the violence exercised by the Eutychians in Alexandria, had interrupted the offering of the sacrifice, and the benediction of the chrism. In his letter to the bishops of the province of Vieme, he states, in strong terms, the primacy of St. Peter and the authority of the Roman See (2); that authority he himself exercised over the christian world, as appears from his works. He frequently recommends himself to the saints reigning

*Serm. 13. de Sanctis.

(1) Ep. 125. Edit. quer. (2) Ep. 10.

reigning in Heaven, and exhorts others to place a confidence in their interceſſion (3); he honors their relics and feſtivals, *ibid.* He rebuilt the church of St. Paul, painted on the ceiling in Moſaic work the images of Chriſt and the twenty-four Elders (4). He placed at the ſepulchres of the apoſtles, guardians, in Latin called *cameiarir*, ſee Fleury, B. 21, cap. 16. He calls the faſt of the lent an apoſtolical tradition, (5). In a letter addreſſed to Theodore, biſhop of Frejus, on penance, he reprimands that prelate for not applying to his metropolitan for inſtruction in the firſt place; then he deſcribes the order of adminiſtering that ſacrament, confeſſion, ſatisfaction, and reconciliation. Penance, he ſays, is by the miniſtry of the paſtors; but by the power of Jeſus Chriſt and the gift of the Holy Ghoſt. This remedy, he ſays, is for the living, not for the dead, who have neglected it: whilſt life continues we are not to ſet bounds to the mercy of God: penance, therefore, muſt not be refuſed to ſinners in the greateſt extremity, who deſire it, if their converſion be ſincere. This letter is dated on the 10th of June, 452, (6). This ſacrament is not of Antichriſt's invention, as it was in uſe before Leo's days, the impoſtor who rejected it as uſeleſs in 1517, was, in all appearance, one of his advanced guard. In a letter addreſſed to the biſhops of Campania, and the two neighbouring provinces of Samnium and Picenum in date the 6th of March, 469, Leo reprimands thoſe prelates for obliging ſome penitents to make a public confeſſion of their ſins, leſt others ſhould be deterred by ſhame, or the fear of their enemies, who might inſtitute a criminal action on their confeſſion. It is enough, ſays he, that ſins be confeſſed to God, and to a prieſt, in a ſecret manner, (7).

Bower, the reformed Jeſuit, in his *Lives of Popes*, ſays of Leo: "he was without doubt a man of extraordinary parts, far ſuperior to all who had governed that church before him, and ſcarce equalled by any ſince."

C Though

(3) Serm. 4. and alibi pluries. (4) Lib. Pon. (5) Serm. de quadrageſima. (6) Epis. de. 83. (7) Epis. 136.

Though Bowers's compilation, which ſerves as a repertory to modern declaimers againſt popery, be replete with the moſt groſs blunders, and the moſt vile calumny, the writer knows no work better calculated to diſabuſe an unprejudiced reader: he ſees in almoſt every line the moſt envenomed rancour contradicting known truth, and ſhameleſsly advancing falſehood in the face of conviction.

To Bower's teſtimony the writer adds that of Fleury, who was not more remarkable for the ſeverity of his ſtrictures on popes, than for the inaccuracy of ſome of his conjectures. The writer would not be underſtood to accuſe Fleury of advancing an intended falſehood. "His ſtyle," ſays he, ſpeaking of the works of Leo, "is noble and elegant, ſhewing the ſolidity of his judgment, the beauty of his imagination, and the greatneſs of his courage.*

The caſtigator, after having amuſed his readers with the tale of Hercules's chair, though he ſeems unwilling to diſpute Peter's having been at Rome, thinks the fact has not been proved by the writer in his Remarks on Doctor Stanſer's Examination. The direct proof offered there, and now again repeated, is *univerſal, uninterrupted, and uncontradicted tradition*, the proof by which all ſuch facts are known, a proof, which bears no reply; this the caſtigator prudently paſſes unnoticed, and pretends to correct a quotation from Euſebius, and a chronological miſtake, as he imagines, with reſpect to Paphias. The writer begs leave to inform him, that the quotations there adduced are merely collateral evidence, in which either inadvertence or error does not in the leaſt affect the direct proof. If Euſebius and Paphias had never exiſted, it would not be the leſs true that Peter was at Rome, nor could that univerſal tradition, which atteſts it, have been the leſs unqueſtionable. The fact was known and believed by millions before Euſebius was born; and on the faith of others he believed it: a Greek writer of the fourth century, who had never ſeen Peter

* Hiſt. Ec. L. 29, N. 16.

Peter nor Rome, could not otherwiſe have known it. Thus, in Nova-Scotia, we know, that a Lewis XIV. reigned in France. In Euſebius's days writers had not yet learned to conſult the ſpirit of divination for the truth of facts; they did not know that men, whom they never ſaw, with whom they had no intercourſe, nor acquaintance, were *depraved* and *corrupt*. The writer is not diſpoſed to waſte time and paper in a grammatical diſcuſſion of a Greek phraſe, nor diſpute with dictionary-makers and ſchoolmaſters, of whom Pope ſays "they may underſtand the ſenſe of one word but no more." However the quotation, as corrected by the caſtigator, is of greater force than as ſtated by the writer: in *Popery Condemned* it ſtands thus: "moreover Peter mentions Mark in his firſt epiſtle, which, as they ſay, was written at Rome; Peter himſelf intimates as much, calling Rome, by a figure, Babylon, in theſe words: the church which is *at* Babylon, in the text, *in* Babylon, &c." The caſtigator excludes Paphias from the number of Euſebius's informers, and ſubſtitutes the pronoun *they*: This pronoun muſt imply more than one, conſequently the force of the teſtimony is encreaſed; Euſebius in that place does not cite Paphias or others to ſhew that Peter was at Rome, he ſuppoſes the fact known to the world; but he cites Paphias, or, as the caſtigator will have it, public opinion, that Peter wrote his firſt epiſtle from Rome, and he confirms this opinion expreſsly, ſaying: "Peter himſelf intimates as much, calling Rome Babylon." Is this caſtigator ſtupid enough to believe that Peter called the church of Rome Babylon, whilſt he himſelf governed it? If he does, is there any man ſo deſtitute of common ſenſe as to believe him? Peter and John called the city of Rome *Babylon*, and juſtly: it was the head of the Roman empire, immerſed in idolatry and all ſorts of uncleanneſs, perſecuting the church with unrelenting fury, as Babylon of old did the Jews.

The caſtigator, who muſt fill a pamphlet with ſomething, finds that Paphias was not a diſciple of the apoſtles.

It

It is of little consequence whether Paphias was cotemporary with the apostles, when it is certain that he was instructed by their immediate successors, however it is not the less true that he was cotemporary with some of them : St. John the Evangelist died at Ephesus in the year 99 of our Æra, and Paphias was bishop of Hieropalis in Phrygia, in 111, that is twelve years after the death of the evangelist. If we suppose him at the age of 50 years, when he was chosen bishop, he must have been near 40 when John died. Whether the commencement of our Æra be correct or not, the time elapsed between John's death, and his accession to the episcopal dignity is the same.*

Paphias was a disciple of John the priest of Ephesus, an immediate disciple of Jesus Christ. It is conjectured that this John was not the evangelist, because Paphias, as cited by Eusebius, says, "I did not approve those, who said many things, but those, who taught the truth ; nor those who related strange precepts, but those who related the precepts, which the Lord entrusted to us, and which proceed from truth itself. If any one came, who had followed the ancients, I asked him what they *said* ; what said Andrew, or Peter, or Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or some other of the disciples of our Lord, what Aristion said or John the old disciple of our Lord.† Whether this John be the evangelist or not, which is mere matter of conjecture, he is properly called an apostle, as he was a priest and immediate disciple of Jesus Christ. Thus St. Paul calls Andronicus and Junias apostles.‡ The spirit of contradiction as well as the spirit of divination deceives this castigator. We have from the history of Paphias, what he does not wish to know, that in the apostles days, their words as well as their writings were collected by their immediate disciples, and transmitted to their successors ; hence that injunction of St. Paul, to his disciple Timothy : "the things, which you have heard from me

* Fleur. Ec. Hist. Lib. 3, N. 15. † Eus. Lib. 3. Cap. ult. ‡ Rom. ult. 5.

me by many witneſſes, theſe commit to faithful men, who will be capable of teaching others."* On the teſtimony of theſe men, we know the apoſtolical traditions.

The caſtigator, from his profound knowledge of antiquity and deep reſearches in the works of Lucan, of Philoſtratus and Pliny, finds that Seleucia on the Tigris, was called Babylon.† He might find a Babylon in Shropſhire or Fifeſhire, for what the writer knows; but he will find it difficult to find a Babylon either there or in Syria, which correſponds with St. John's deſcription, that is, built on ſeven hills, and commanding the kings of the earth. Euſebius never dreamed of this Babylon ſirnamed Seleucia. But Dupin, a Popiſh Polemic of great candour, better verſed in ſcripture and antiquity than all the Romiſh clergy on this ſide the atlantic ‡ contradicts Euſebius; "this interpretation," ſays Dupin, "is falſe, "and it is more natural to ſay that he wrote this epiſtle from Babylon." It is the firſt time that the writer has ſeen Dupin numbered amongſt Popiſh Polemics; he has ſeen him more than once ranked with Fra Paoli, amongſt lurking hypocrites. Whatever opinion the caſtigator may have of his erudition, he has given a very bad ſpecimen of his modeſty: A Frenchman writing in 1686, before he had attained the age of thirty years contradicts Euſebius a Greek writer near the cloſe of the third century, of whom it is ſaid *that he knew all that was written before him*, and whoſe chronicle including events from the commencement of time to the 20th year of Conſtantine's reign, is the principal fund, which remains for the ſtudy of chronology.

Dupin did not confine his ſtrictures to Euſebius: he cenſured, with ſuch petulant ſeverity, the ſtyle, the doctrine, and the qualities of eccleſiaſtical writers of antiquity that Boſſuet, the celebrated biſhop of Meaux, who knew ſomething of antiquity too, denounced him to Harlay, then arch-biſhop of Paris, who obliged Dupin publicly to retract his unfounded conjectures. He was obliged

* 2. Tim. ii. 2. † p. 6. ‡ p. 19.

obliged to a ſecond retraction on a more ſerious occaſion in 1703, and diſmiſſed from his profeſſorſhip,—ſee his life, by his friends in the hiſtorical dictionary. His errors have been aſcribed by ſome to the impetuoſity of his diſpoſition, by others, to reaſons not very honorable, which the writer paſſes in ſilence; but whether we believe his friends or his enemies, there was more pliability in the man's conſcience, than is conſiſtent with a ſincere regard to truth.

However reluctantly the caſtigator is forced to admit that Peter was at Rome, but, ſays he, it does not follow as a conſequent that he was Biſhop of that See.* No: he was in many other cities as well as in Rome: Why theſe unwearied exertions to perplex a plain truth? The writer did not ſtate it as a conſequent: he ſtated a propoſition, which gives this caſtigator great anxiety, and he ſtates it again: that there is as great a certainty that Peter did eſtabliſh his See at Rome, as that the ſcriptures are divinely inſpired. This propoſition he has proved more than once already; againſt the peremptory reaſons which eſtabliſh it, all ſuppoſitions are vain: for it is an intuitive truth that facts reſting on the ſame authority are equally certain. Will he condeſcend to admit that theſe many millions of chriſtians, whom he calls papiſts, do believe it? That it was believed by the chriſtian world when Luther firſt oppoſed the Pope in 1517? That it was univerſally believed in 1215, when the fourth council of Lateran was celebrated? That in Charlemagne's time, that is in 814, it was believed by the then chriſtian world? That at the celebration of the general council of Chalcedon in 451, it was believed? In that council we have on public record the names of three hundred and ſixty biſhops, Greeks, Aſiatics and Africans, who believed it. Will this caſtigator, or any of his friends, tell us when or where it was not believed? The firſt act of the council of Chalcedon, which is acknowledged by the church of England as a lawful council,

* p. 19.

cil, gives the moſt authentic evidence, that the biſhop of Rome was then, and before, univerſally acknowledged head of the catholic church. The firſt aſſembly of this council was held in the church of Saint Euphemia on the eighth of the ides of October, under the conſulſhip of Marcien, fourth indiction, that is, the eighth of October, 451. There were preſent, with the prelates, nineteen of the chief officers of the court: Anatolius, general of the troops, who had been conſul of the year 440, Tatien, governor of Conſtantinople, Palladius, ſuperintendant of the court, Sporatius, captain of the guards, &c. The biſhops named in the acts are 360: at the head of theſe are, Paſchaſinus, biſhop of Lilibee in Sicily, Lucentius, biſhop of Aſcoli, and Boniface, prieſt of the Roman church, the pope's legates, then Anatolius, biſhop of Conſtantinople, Dioſcorus of Alexandria, Maximus of Antioch, and Juvenal of Jeruſalem; theſe are patriarchal Sees; the archbiſhops and biſhops are named in their reſpective orders; the order of ſitting is thus deſcribed: the magiſtrates and ſenators in the middle, before the baluſtrade of the altar, to the left, the place of honor in the church, were the pope's legates, then Anatolius of Conſtantinople, Maximus of Antioch, Thalaſſius of Ceſarea, Stephen of Epheſus, and the biſhops of the dioceſes of the Eaſt, of Pontus, of Aſia, and Thrace, in their order; on the right was, Dioſcorus of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jeruſalem, Quintillus of Heraclea, in Macedonia, repreſenting Anaſtaſius of Theſſalonica, Peter of Corinth, then the other biſhops of Egypt; of Illyricum and Paleſtine in their order; the goſpel in the middle; the biſhop Paſchaſinus, the pope's legate, ſpoke firſt, and addreſſing himſelf to the magiſtrates, he ſaid: "We have the orders of the biſhop of Rome, *head of all churches*, directing that Dioſcorus ſhould not ſit in the council; therefore, if it pleaſe your lordſhips, let him retire, or we retire:" Paſchaſinus ſpoke in Latin; his words were explained in Greek, by Beronicien, ſecretary of the emperor's conſiſtory. The ſenators and magiſtrates

giſtrates ſaid: " what particular complaint is there againſt the moſt reverend biſhop Dioſcorus?" Lucentius, the other legate, replied: " he muſt give an account of his judgment. He has uſurped the authority of a Judge, *and preſumed to hold a Council without the authority of the Holy See, what never was done nor allowed.*" Paſchaſinus added: we cannot diſobey the orders of the pope, nor the canons of the church. Dioſcorus, therefore, quitted his ſeat by order of the magiſtrates, and ſat in the middle of the aſſembly,—ſee the firſt act of the council of Chalcedon.

Here we have the moſt authentic evidence upon record, of the biſhop of Rome's juriſdiction over all churches, acknowledged and exerciſed in preſence of the Greek Emperor's miniſters of ſtate, repreſenting his Imperial Majeſty, in preſence of Anatolius, patriarch of Conſtantinople, of Dioſcorus, patriarch of Alexandria, of Maximus, patriarch of Antioch, of Juvenal, patriarch of Jeruſalem; in preſence of 350 prelates, ſubiect to the juriſdiction of theſe patriarchs. If the pope's juriſdiction had been doubtful, if there had been a poſſibility of conteſting it, would they all have thus tamely acquieſced? Would not Dioſcorus and his party, at leaſt, have reſiſted it? They had the moſt cogent reaſons, and the ſtrongeſt inclination to decline it, if they could diſcover any evaſion.

In the ſecond Act of that Council, on the ſixth of the Ides, that is, the tenth of the month of October, when the Pope's Letter to the Council was read, the Prelates exclaimed: " That is the faith of our fathers; the faith of the apoſtles; we all believe ſo; Peter has ſpoken by Leo."

At this diſtance, both of time and place, we know the doctrine taught in Conſtantinople and Rome in the days of Leo the Great; we know the names of the Prelates who occupied all the Patriarchal Sees in the chriſtian world; we know the diſtricts over which they preſided, the order of precedence in their aſſemblies. Did theſe men,

men, who were not inferior to us in point of ſcience—their works are yet extant? Did theſe men, the writer aſks once more, did they know nothing of their own predeceſſors? Did they know nothing of the doctrine taught in the dioceſes, over which they preſided, for two or three centuries before? All reaſoning is loſt on the man who pretends to believe ſuch an abſurdity; and the man who is duped by ſuch nonſenſe is rather an object of contempt than pity.

Of the many authorities adduced by the writer in his remarks on Dr. Stanſer's Examination, the caſtigator ſays there are but two who wrote before the fourth century. The writer refers him to the prelates aſſembled in the council of Chalcedon: they had in their hands the writings of their predeceſſors; and, through them, we know them. If the writer has not cited many writers of the ſecond century, it is becauſe there are but few writers of the three firſt centuries, whoſe works have been tranſmitted to us. There were no printers in them days. The few, who ventured to write in defence of chriſtianity, confined themſelves to eſtabliſh the divinity of Chriſt's miſſion, and to juſtify their faith againſt the falſe imputations of the heathen philoſophers: for chriſtianity was then, as it is now, groſsly miſrepreſented. The heathen philoſophers declaimed againſt the abominations and corruptions of chriſtianity under the appellations of ſuperſtition and atheiſm, with as much virulence as new modelled miniſters declaim againſt the ſame chriſtianity, under the appellation of popery. But if the writer did not cite theſe very ancient writers, whoſe works are not in his hands, he has cited their immediate ſucceſſors, in whoſe hands they were, the Euſebius's, the Jeromes', the Auſtins', the Optatus's, &c. To them he refers the caſtigator. Does he pretend to refute the teſtimony of men who occaſionally relate, what the world knew, by the ſilence of others, who have not ſpoken on the ſubject at all? This is a new modelled ſort of refutation.

Reſtleſs imagination, if not deſpair, ſuggeſts another

resource: it is hardly possible for a writer, not divinely assisted, to be so correct, and exact in the choice, and disposition of his terms, that no incorrect, or incautious expression shall escape him: the scriptures themselves are frequently distorted from their intended signification, and, either through malice or ignorance, forced to speak the language of error. If such an incautious expression be found in the works of an ancient writer, the spirit of imposture or illusion fastens on it; as the beetle on the sore, pretends to make an incorrect expression, which escapes the vigilance of the writer, a rule to determine the sense of all the passages, in which the writer clearly and expressly conveys his thoughts. Common sense prescribes a different rule, according to which the sense of all incorrect, or incautious, expressions must be determined by the subject matter, the scope of the writer, and the whole tenor of the work. From a total disregard of this rule of common sense, and an adoption of that, which imposture prescribes, opinions are lent to men, which never crossed their imagination, and which are expressly condemned in their works. At the commencement of the Reformation, whilst there was yet some respect for antiquity, this plan was adopted: incautious expressions, and insulated passages, were cited from ancient writers to justify the pretence of reviving primitive christianity; but as it was found impossible to make the Fathers speak a language, which they had not learned, without new modelling the whole of their works, and catholics then, as they are yet, the keepers of their own records, not being disposed to pass in silence such a diabolical deception, after a few ineffectual efforts to reform the Fathers, they were peaceably resigned to their old possessors, and an appeal made to the scriptures alone. The castigator thinks he may revive the plan of his ancestors. The writer recommends to him a careful perusal of the works of Flaccus Illyricus and his associates, the century writers of Magdeburgh. In the lucubrations of these indefatigable reformers,

formers, he will find every incautious expreſſion, and every obſcure paſſage, which may with any appearance of truth be diſtorted in ſupport of the Reformation; but he muſt at the ſame time adviſe him not to open the works of theſe ancient writers, if he underſtands their language, he will find them incorrigible papiſts, as deeply immerſed in popiſh ſuperſtitions, ſuch as praying for departed ſouls, honoring ſaints and angels, invoking them, preſcribing faſts and abſtinences, recommending celibacy and good works, &c. as the writer of theſe remarks. The caſtigator, therefore, muſt confine himſelf to read the garbled paſſages extracted from their works, by Flaccus Illyricus, with his commentaries on them, and he will be ſatisfied that, they were all good proteſtants, one thouſand years before there was a proteſtant in the world. He will alſo find, in the works of that celebrated reformer, a treatiſe, in which he demonſtrates, in his uſual way, that the papacy is an invention of the devil; that the pope is the devil himſelf. It is not eaſy to reconcile this opinion with the received opinion of proteſtants, that the pope is Antichriſt, for, after all, Antichriſt, bad as he is, is not the devil. The reverend Mr. Pariſh, in a late publication, has reformed this opinion: he ſays that Bonaparte is Antichriſt. It ſeems that he has ſuperſeded the pope; perhaps in the courſe of time he may ſuperſede the devil himſelf. The writer fears that old Davy will prove too hard for him. Future ages will ſcarcely belive that, in our days, human credulity is the ſport of ſuch nonſenſe, or that ſuch groſs impoſture ſhould find dupes.

The caſtigator, in imitation of his friend Illyricus, diſtorts the paſſage adduced from Ireneus: this father, if we believe him, appears to have been a ſtranger to Peter's particular relation to the Roman See.* This he pretends to deduce from Ireneus's words: "The bleſſed apoſtles, Peter and Paul, having founded and built (edified) the church, delivered to Linus the epiſcopal office, him Paul mentioned

* p. 20.

mentioned in his epiſtles to Timothy; Anencletus ſucceeded him; after whom, in the third place from the apoſtles, Clement had the biſhopric." Does the caſtigator pretend that to found a church is not a particular relation to it? But he thinks that Paul had an equal title. That Paul, by his words, his works and writings, did aſſiſt in founding and edifying the Roman church, is unqueſtionably true; that the Roman church knew and profeſſed the doctrine taught by Peter and Paul, is equally true. By this doctrine, preſerved in the Roman church, and tranſmitted in regular ſucceſſion from paſtor to paſtor, ſince the apoſtles' days, Ireneus confounds all hereſies; by the ſame rule, errors are condemned to this day: "we can," ſaid he, "enumerate thoſe, whom the apoſtles eſtabliſhed biſhops in the churches, and their ſucceſſors down to us .... but ſince it would be too long to enumerate the ſucceſſion of all churches, we ſhall content ourſelves with indicating the *tradition* of the greateſt, and moſt ancient church, known to the whole world, founded and eſtabliſhed at Rome by the glorious apoſtles Peter and Paul; and by this *tradition*, which it has received from the apoſtles, and this faith announced to men, and preſerved to our days by the ſucceſſion of biſhops, we confound all thoſe who make unlawful aſſemblies, in any manner, whether through ſelf-love, vain glory, blindneſs or malice."* Ireneus ſhews, that the doctrine taught by Peter and Paul, was tranſmitted, in regular ſucceſſion, through the paſtors of the Roman church; he did not inquire, whether Peter or Paul had firſt founded that church, it was a public fact, of which no man doubted in his days: the Romans tell this caſtigator, that the church of Rome was founded before Paul ſaw Italy; and that it was then celebrated for the purity of its faith, we know from Paul himſelf in his epiſtle to the Romans, i. 8: "your faith is celebrated in the whole world." Theſe ſame Romans tell him, and they ought to know ſomething of the founder of their

* Lib. 3, cap. 3.

their own church, that Peter, with his disciple Mark, and others, had founded that church long before Paul had seen it, and on their testimony it was believed by the christian world. How are facts known, but by the testimony of witnesses? Thus Eusebius knew it, and states precisely the time in his chronicle of the lxiv. year: "Peter, by nation a Galilean, the first *pontiff of christians*, when he had first founded the church of Antioch, goes to Rome, where, preaching the gospel twenty-five years, he remained bishop of that city." Thus all those writers, who have been cited in the Remarks on Doctor Stanser's Examination, knew it—see Remarks, p. 177, and seq. They also tell him, that Paul was neither his predecessor nor successor in office, though he was his most zealous fellow labourer, and this they demonstrate beyond the possibility of contradiction: for Peter was entrusted with the care of Christ's flock before Paul was a christian: John, xxi.—"feed my lambs; feed my ewes;" and it does not appear that Paul was ordered to supersede him: that was reserved for the evangelist of Wirtemberg; nor was Paul Peter's successor; they died the same day.

"The church of Rome," says the castigator, "would never indeed acknowledge Pope, Paul the First. Epiphanius and Ireneus have been more complaisant."* The passages which he endeavours to distort, in order to perplex the truth, tell against him: Epiphanius says, "Peter and Paul were the first at Rome, both bishops and apostles." Epiphanius does not say that Paul was prior to Peter or superior to him, on the contrary he gives Paul the second place. He says that, "Paul was at Rome a bishop and apostle." Who ever doubted it? But this castigator ought to know that Paul, though a bishop and apostle, was one of Peter's flock; and if he does not know it, Epiphanius, on whom he endeavours to impose his nonsense, will inform him. This father says, "Christ chose Peter to be the leader of his disciples."† And in the work called the *Anchor*, speaking of Peter, he says: "this

* p. 23. † Her. 51.

" this is he, who heard—'feed my lambs'—to whom the fold was entruſted." The paſſage which he cites from Ireneus tells pointedly againſt him : " Alexander was the fifth in ſucceſſion from Peter and Paul." Peter therefore muſt have been biſhop of Rome, or Alexander could not have been the fifth in ſucceſſion from him. Ireneus did not conſider Paul as joint biſhop of Rome with Peter, as this caſtigator impoſes on him ; he knew that there were not two biſhops of the ſame See : and if he had conſidered Paul as biſhop, with Peter, of the See of Rome the paſſage does not tell the leſs forcibly againſt the caſtigator, for he aſſigns the ſecond place to Paul, and his apoſtolical authority ſhould of courſe deſcend to the biſhop of Rome as his ſucceſſor : however, it is not as Paul's ſucceſſor that the biſhop of Rome claims an univerſal ſpiritual juriſdiction over the chriſtian church : for Paul could have no ſucceſſor in an office, which he never poſſeſſed. The power of feeding Chriſt's flock was veſted in Peter before Paul was a chriſtian.

The caſtigator, in his great zeal to refute the Remarks on Doctor Stanſer's Examination, ruins the cauſe of that new modelled church, of which he is himſelf a miniſter. He tells us that Peter was a biſhop. If ſo the epiſcopal order is of divine inſtitution in the chriſtian church. The church, therefore, in which this order is not found, is not the church of Chriſt. The man, who denies this conſequence, is deſtitute of common ſenſe, or perverſely obſtinate. Was the caſtigator aware of this conſequence ? Or did he honeſtly intend to undeceive theſe deluded mortals, who are taught to believe that all eccleſiaſtical authority is veſted in themſelves, and derived from them to miniſters of their own inſtitution ?

In the ſame paragraph in which the caſtigator ſays, that Peter was a biſhop and apoſtle, he tells us that, the offices of an apoſtle and a biſhop are incompatible : in other words, that Peter was inveſted, at the ſame time, with two offices incompatible. This, to plain men,

has

has all the appearance of nonſenſe. If Peter was a biſhop, as he ſays, what would prevent him from governing the church of Rome or Antioch, or any other church as a biſhop? His apoſtolical commiſſion, if we believe the caſtigator. Commonſenſe replies that his apoſtolical commiſſion did not invalidate his Epiſcopal authority; it only ſtrengthened and encreaſed it. He governed the church of Antioch for ſeven years as biſhop, whilſt he governed the univerſal church as ſupreme paſtor of Chriſt's flock, if the chriſtian world in former times be not deceived. Hence Antioch is called an apoſtolical See, and if he had continued to govern that church as biſhop to his death, the biſhop of that See, and not the biſhop of Rome, would have been his ſucceſſor in office.

The caſtigator aſks if the people of Rome had appointed Peter Biſhop of that See? To this the writer replies, that the time was not yet come, of which St. Paul ſays: "There will be a time, when they will not bear the doctrine of ſalvation; but according to their irregular deſires (*Epithumias*) they will collect teachers for themſelves, with itching ears."* The time is now come—the caſtigator knows it. The flock in Peter's days had not yet learned to conduct the ſhepherd.

To the other queries, intended to embarraſs the ignorant or miſlead the unwary, by perplexing the known truth, the writer replies: that Peter's commiſſion to rule his maſter's flock, includes the ſubordinate authority of biſhop, prieſt and deacon, as the authority of the prince includes the ſubordinate authority of all officers under him. This authority Peter exerciſed when and where he thought it convenient, according to the directions of his divine maſter, in whom all ſpiritual authority to rule his church is veſted, and from whom it muſt be derived, according to the order, which he was pleaſed to inſtitute. This doctrine may not be ſo pleaſing to the caſtigator, but it is not the leſs true, nor the leſs conſonant with our ideas of order. Peter's authority, indiſpenſably neceſſary for

* 2. Tim. iv. 3.

for the good government of the flock, for the support of union, unanimity, peace and subordination, continued until death, and then passed to his successor in office. For Christ's paternal care of his flock did not cease when Peter ceased to conduct it; nor did that authority, vested in Peter for the welfare of the flock, expire with Peter: it yet subsists, and will continue to subsist, whilst Christ, the supreme pastor, has a flock on earth, that is, to the consummation. This is a plain statement. The man must be stupid who does not conceive it, and warped by interest, prejudice, passion, or something worse, who does not believe it.

The castigator finds a subterfuge, as he imagines, in the doubt expressed by some writers, whether Linus, Clement or Anacletus, was Peter's immediate successor; does he imagine that the Roman church, then in being, did not know their own bishop? If there be some, who, at this distance of time, doubt which of these three pontiffs was Peter's immediate successor, there are none who doubt that one of them did succeed him immediately, and the other two in succession. Their successors, down to the present day, we know, during a long interval of 1700 years. Would this castigator condescend to oblige us with the succession of pastors in his new modelled church? Or is he the first, and must his successors date from him? Does his ambition aspire to the honor of being the founder of so great a family.

In the next chapter the castigator pretends to refute the reasons urged in support of Peter's supremacy, his first attempt is rather aukward; in the course of the work he formally condemns it. The writer in his remarks on Doctor Stanser, had said: "if christianity be founded on the apostles, because they taught the christian religion, it must be founded in the first place on Peter, because he, first of all men, confessed Christ to be by nature son of the living God." This, if we believe the castigator, was confessed by the prophets, before the apostle's days: "it has been," he gravely tells us, "a received opinion in the church,

church, that the chriſtian religion, or the religion of Chriſt, was publiſhed in the world a few thouſand years before the days of the apoſtles."* That the divinity of the promiſed Meſſias was predicted by the prophets Chriſtians demonſtrate againſt Jews, Deiſts and Socinians; but that the chriſtian religion was publiſhed before the days of Chriſt, or his apoſtles, is an extraordinary paradox; if it be a received opinion in the church, it muſt be in ſome church of the caſtigator's invention; the chriſtian church does not know it. Lapſe of time had effaced this opinion from the caſtigator's mind before he had arrived at the end of his work. "The angel," he ſays, "did not direct Cornelius to the ſcriptures; but the reaſon is obvious: it was the deſign of God to exhibit to him the Saviour already crucified, and exalted as a foundation of faith, for the remiſſion of ſins, to both Jews and Gentiles. The angel, therefore, could not direct him to the old teſtament ſcriptures, becauſe they taught no ſuch doctrine."† Is it that the belief of the crucifixion of Chriſt for the remiſſion of ſins is no part of the chriſtian religion? This caſtigator finds truth variable, he bends it to his opinions, and fits it to his purpoſe. How unfortunate for the caſtigator that truth is in itſelf, ſo ſtubborn, ſo unmanageable? All his efforts to perplex it are vain. It is yet true that Peter was the firſt who did confeſs Chriſt, as man, to be Son of God, by nature. In the prophets' days Chriſt was not yet man, they therefore did not, nor could not, confeſs him to be, as man, true Son by nature, of the Living God. This firſt miſtake he endeavours to enforce by another: Peter's confeſſion, ſays he, was the teſtimony of his faith concerning what the prophets had written. If we believe the evangeliſt, Peter's confeſſion was the teſtimony of his faith in Jeſus Chriſt, to whom he ſpoke—whom he acknowledged true-Son of the Living God; and this he did not learn from the prophets, whoſe writings, in all appearance, he had not

 read,

* p. 26. † p. 229.

read, but from the immediate revelation of God: "bleſſed art thou Simon, ſon of John, ſaid the Saviour, becauſe fleſh and blood did not reveal to thee, but my Father, who is in Heaven."

It is doubtful whether his next effort to perplex the truth be the effect of ignorance or artifice. "If Peter's excellent confeſſion produced this declaration, upon what authority," ſays he, "does the writer overlook his confeſſion and fix on his perſon as the baſis of the church?" Does this caſtigator think Peter's confeſſion ſomething really diſtinct from his perſon? If ſo, his ignorance is deſpicable, if not, why does he aſſign a mere quality which has no independent exiſtence as the baſis of Chriſt's church? Is it that he thinks the church of Chriſt an imaginary Being? The writer now tells him on what authority he fixes on Peter's perſon, and not on his confeſſion: the unerring authority of Jeſus Chriſt, who did not bleſs Peter's confeſſion, but Peter himſelf, ſaying: "bleſſed art thou Simon, ſon of John," who did not ſpeak to Peter's confeſſion, but to his perſon, ſaying: "I ſay unto thee," who did not call Peter's confeſſion a rock, but Peter himſelf, ſaying: "thou art a rock," and, finally, who did not ſay that he would build his church on Peter's confeſſion, but on his perſon, ſaying, : "and on this rock will I build my church." To this the writer adds a ſecond authority, that is, the authority of common ſenſe: Peter's confeſſion of faith was neither the foundation of the church, nor a member of the church, nor any part or parcel of the church. His confeſſion of faith qualified Peter himſelf to be a member of the church, and the almighty power of Chriſt performing after his reſurrection, what he then promiſed, gave him the ſtrength and ſolidity neceſſary to ſupport that myſterious building. As in a material building, it is not the figure nor the qualities of the ſtones, which compoſe the walls, but the ſtones themſelves, ſhaped and fitted by the builders.

"The ſcriptures," he ſays, "declare confeſſion to be the

the ground on which the church ſtands." The ſcriptures do not ſpeak nonſenſe; St. Peter thus deſcribes the church; Chriſt he calls *a living ſtone*, "*Lithon Zonta*," on whom the faithful are built as *living ſtones*, "*Lithoi Zontes*:"* he does not ſay that the faith of the people was raiſed on the faith of Chriſt, to form a church of this caſtigator's invention: faith is one of theſe virtues which Chriſt did not poſſeſs; there is no other Chriſt in whom he believed.

Illyricus, and his aſſociates, in the commencement of the Reformation, had collected from the Fathers, ſeveral paſſages, ſome entire, others garbled, all inſulated and diſtorted, in order to perſuade their deluded followers, that there was ſome ſimilarity between their new doctrines and theſe of the primitive church; from this repertory the caſtigator tranſcribes ſome paſſages, with which he makes a diſplay of erudition, which coſt him the labour of tranſcribing and tranſlating. If artful efforts to continue a deception, and lead the ſtray ſheep to the precipice, could be a ſubject of amuſement to a ſober man, the vanity of this caſtigator, would amuſe, and the folly of obtruding on the public paſſages, from the writings of men, who uniformly condemn the errors, in ſupport of which they are adduced, would excite a ſmile of contempt.

The firſt paſſage he cites, is from St. Hilary, who ſays: "this, therefore, is the only immoveable foundation, this is the only bleſſed rock, which Peter confeſſed: thou art the Chriſt, the Son of the living God." What chriſtian does not know that Chriſt is the immoveable rock, the primary foundation on which the church is built? Does it follow that Chriſt did not call his diſciple Simon, ſon of John, a rock? The Syriac term, *Kepha*, and the Greek term, *Petros*, ſignify nothing elſe but a rock. Becauſe Chriſt was, and is, the primary foundation of the church, does it follow that he did not conſtitute Peter a ſecondary foundation? St. Hilary did

* 1ſt Pet. ii. 4.

did not think so: in his commentary on this passage of St. Matthew, "thou art *Peter*, *(a rock)*" he says: "happy *foundation* of the church, in the solemn declaration of a new name, and *rock*, worthy of the building of it, which dissolves the bonds of hell! blessed gate keeper of heaven!" this is one of the Fathers who condemns Popery! *Risum teneatis Amici.*

He next adduces a passage from St. Austin, who says: "the church is at present assaulted by divers trials, as with floods and storms, but it is not destroyed: because it is founded on the rock, whence Peter received his name for the rock is not named from Peter, but he from the rock, as Christ is not named from the christian, but the christian from him; on this account the Lord says: 'upon this rock I will build my church;' because Peter had said: 'thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God;' upon this rock, therefore,' says he, 'which thou hast confessed, I will build my church,' for Christ is the rock upon which Peter himself was built." In this passage Peter's prerogative is clearly expressed, and another truth totally subversive of new modelled churches. It is matter of surprise, that the castigator did not observe it. Austin says, that the rock was not named from Peter, but he from the rock; that Christ is the rock on which Peter himself was built. All this is unquestionably true. Austin, therefore, thought that Peter partook of the stability of that rock, from which he was named, and on which he was built. Austin knew that a name imposed by God in the scriptures invariably expresses the prerogative of the person. Thus the name imposed on the Father of the Faithful, by his parents, *Abram*, which signifies *exalted father*, was changed into *Abraham*, which imports *father of a multitude*, and the reason assigned: "because, said the Lord, I have given thee father to a multitude of nations.* *Chi al hamon goim nathathika.* The name *Sarai*, which signifies *my Queen*, was changed into *Sarah*, which signifies *a Queen*

* Gen. xvii. 5.

Queen, without reſtriction, and the reaſon alſo aſſigned, becauſe ſhe was to be the Mother of Nations and Kings.

A ſecond truth, as yet more alarming, Auſtin demonſtrates in that paſſage. "The church," ſays he, "is aſſaulted by divers trials as with floods and ſtorms; but it is not deſtroyed, becauſe it is founded on the rock." He thought, as catholics do now, that floods and ſtorms, trials and perſecutions, the united efforts of earth and hell were ineffectual againſt the church built on the rock, that is founded by Chriſt, conducted by his Spirit, and protected by his Almighty Power. Some reformers, in his days, had ſaid, that the church had periſhed: this bold aſſertion has been frequently repeated ſince his time; hear his reply: "that church, which was of all nations, is no more; it has periſhed." This, they ſay, who are not in it. The impudent aſſertion! Is it not, becauſe you are not in it? See leaſt, therefore, you be not, for it will be, though you be not. This aſſertion; abominable, deteſtable, full of preſumption and falſehood, ſupported by no truth, enlightened by no wiſdom, ſeaſoned by no ſalt, vain, raſh, precipitate, pernicious—the Spirit of God foreſaw, on account of thoſe who ſay: it was, and it is not; for thoſe, who ſay: the ſcriptures are fulfilled, all nations have believed, but the church of all nations has apoſtatiſed, it has periſhed. What is this? *Behold I am with you until the conſummation of the age*.... Why is it that you ſay: the church of all nations has periſhed, when for this the goſpel is preached that it may be in all nations? Therefore, until the end of time, the church in all nations; ſectaries may periſh, let them ceaſe to be what they are, that they may be what they are not.

In the paſſage adduced by the caſtigator, St. Auſtin ſays: that "the church is founded on Chriſt, the Rock which Peter confeſſed. In that he was perfectly correct. But that the demonſtrative pronoun *tauté*, *this*, had a reference to *Petrà*, *a Rock*, implied in the propoſition, becauſe it did not correſpond with *Petros*, is an unfounded conjecture:

jecture: the Greek terms *Petros* or *Petrà* are indifferently uſed to ſignify a *Rock*, the ſenſe imported by the Syriac term *Kepha*, the name which the Saviour impoſed on his diſciple Simon, ſon of John—this we know from the Evangeliſt, St. John, i, 43: "Thou art Simon, ſon of John; thou ſhalt be called *Kephas*, which, interpreted, is Peter." Hence the Greek tranſlator of St. Matthew uſed the terms Petros and Petrà, of the ſame import, as if to explain the force of the name *Petros* by *Petrà*, which imports nothing but a *Rock*. This introduced a diverſity in the Greek expreſſion, which is not found in the Syriac, the language then in uſe amongſt the Jews. This diverſity in the expreſſion, which St. Auſtin, not underſtanding the Syriac language, did not know, led him to conjecture that the article *tauté this*, not being of the ſame gender with *Petros*, had a reference to ſome other Rock, and, as Chriſt is frequently called a Rock in the ſcriptures, St. Auſtin thought it referred to him. If he had known that this diverſity did not exiſt in the language ſpoken by the Saviour, he muſt have ſeen that the article *tauté*, *this*, could have no reference but to the Rock of which Chriſt had ſpoken, and that was *Peter*, a Rock: no other Rock was mentioned before. Hence we find that Jerome, who was a perfect maſter of both languages, in his expoſition of the paſſage in St. Matthew, refers the article to Peter: "According to the metaphor, *Petrà*, a *Rock*, it is rightly ſaid—I will build my church on thee;" and, in his letter to Pope Damaſus concerning the term '*Hypoſtaſis*,' then in diſpute, he ſays, ſpeaking of the Chair (the See) of Peter: "I know that the church is built on this Rock."

That St. Auſtin's expoſition of the paſſage was a conjecture, founded on the diverſity of expreſſion introduced by the Greek tranſlator, we know from himſelf: "I ſaid, in ſome place, of the apoſtle Peter, that on him, as on a Rock, the church was founded, which ſenſe is ſung by the mouths of many, in the verſes of the moſt bleſſed Ambroſe; who, ſpeaking of the Cock, ſays: 'at the crowing of the Cock the *Rock* of the Church waſhes away

away his fault;' I know alſo that very often after I explained it ſo, that *on this Rock* might be underſtood on him whom Peter confeſſed; for it was not ſaid to him 'thou art *Petrà* but *Petros*'—of theſe two expoſitions the reader may chuſe that which he thinks the more probable."*

From this paſſage we learn that though Auſtin, deceived by the diverſity of expreſſion, introduced into the Greek verſion, thought this expoſition probable, he thought that of St. Ambroſe equally probable, and more univerſally adopted. We know the motive of his conjecture was fallacious: for Jerome expreſsly ſays, that *Kepha* ſignifies a rock; and in the Syriac verſion of the old Teſtament, the Hebrew terms *Selah*, a rock, is invariably expreſſed by the Syriac term *Kepha*. Hence Ambroſe's expoſition of the paſſage is incontrovertibly correct; it prevailed in his time, before his time, and after it. Since his time, there can be no doubt: becauſe the verſes of which St. Auſtin ſpeaks, compoſe the hymn for lauds on the three ſundays before Lent, in the Roman breviary in general uſe. It is true theſe ſons of pleaſure, the reformed Monks, with the arch-reformer at their head, abjured and exploded the breviary with all other *unprofitable auſterities*. See Review, p. 154.

In Ambroſe's time we know it to prevail from his own and Auſtin's teſtimony. That it prevailed before his time, we have the teſtimony of Greeks and Latins.

Origen, who underſtood, if ever man did, the original ſcriptures, in his Homily on the 5th of Exodus, ſays: "ſee what was ſaid by the Lord to that great foundation of the church, and that moſt firm rock, on which Chriſt founded his church: Man of little faith, why have you doubted? It was Peter whom Chriſt thus reproached, when his confidence failed, and he began to ſink."

Baſil, in his ſecond book againſt Eunomius, ſays: "Peter, for the excellence of his faith, received on himſelf the building of the church Epiphanius in Anchora: the Lord conſtituted Peter, the firſt of the apoſtles, a ſolid rock, on whom the church of God is built."

Chryſoſtom

* Lib. 1, Ret. Cap. 21.

Chryſoſtom in his 55th homily on St. Matthew: "the Lord ſaid thou art Peter, (a rock) and on thee will I build my church". The expoſition of the Latins coincides with that of the Greeks.

Tertullian: "was any thing concealed from Peter, called the rock, on which the church was to be built?"

Cyprian, in his letter to Quintus, ſays: "the Lord choſe Peter firſt, and on him built his church," in a word, this was univerſally believed. St. Auſtin himſelf, though he thought it probable that the terms *this rock*, might have a reference to Chriſt, did not preſume to contradict the contrary opinion, nor did he ever doubt of Peter and Peter's ſucceſſors in the See of Rome, being the firſt paſtors of the chriſtian church: in his letter to Glorius Eleuſinus, ſpeaking of pope Melchiades, he ſays: "the good man! the child of chriſtian peace and father of the chriſtian people!*

The writer cites a paſſage from Auſtin's works. The caſtigator may diſregard his authority, but he will find his reaſoning invincible. In a letter to Generoſus, yet extant, he ſays, N°. 1: "as you hold the chriſtianity not of one city only, nor of Africa only, nor of the Africans, but of the whole world, which was announced, and is announced to all nations. . . . . It has been evangelized to you by the prophetical and apoſtolical writings, that promiſes were made to Abraham and to his ſeed, that is, to Chriſt, when God ſaid to him, Gen. xxii. 18: 'in thy ſeed ſhall *all Nations* be bleſſed.' As you have theſe promiſes, if an angel from heaven ſhould ſay to you, relinquiſh the chriſtianity of the world, and hold the party of Donatus, he ought to be accurſed, becauſe he would endeavour to cut you off from the whole, and thruſt you into a part; and cut you off from the promiſes of God."

What does the caſtigator think of this reaſoning? Is it true, as St. Auſtin ſays, and demonſtrates, by what has all the appearance of concluſive and irreſiſtible argument,

* Ep. 43, *alias* 162.

ment, that a man, even an angel, who would form a party and ſeparate it from the chriſtianity then in the world, would be cut off from the promiſes of God? If ſo what is become of all celebrated reformers? The reforming caſtigator would do well to refute this firſt part of Auſtin's reaſoning: it moſt ſeriouſly intereſts himſelf, and his flock.

Auſtin continues, N°. 2, if, ſays he, the order of biſhops ſucceeding each other be to be conſidered, how much more certainly and ſafely may we enumerate from Peter himſelf, to whom, as he bore the figure of the whole church, the Lord ſaid: on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell ſhall not overcome it, Linus ſucceeded Peter, Clement ſucceeded Linus, Anacletus ſucceeded Clement, then Evariſtus .. .. Anaſtaſius. In this order of biſhops in ſucceſſion there is no Donatiſt biſhop to be found.

In the next number Auſtin ſolves the difficulties againſt catholics, urged from the immoral lives of ſome popes, without enquiring whether the accuſations were well or ill-founded. Diſobedience to exiſting authority, by which all factions, whether in Church or State, muſt commence, is maſked by the pretence of correcting abuſes. If no real abuſe exiſt, the leaders of a faction muſt invent on the principle of ſelf-defence. Hence, there never was a ſect formed, who did not bring heavy accuſations againſt the pontiff then in being, and the catholic prelates in communion with him. From theſe ſources the century writers of Magdeburgh, and Bower, retail that collection of ſlander againſt popes and prelates, nineteen twentieths of which are bare-faced calumnies, contradicted by cotemporary writers. Hear Auſtin's reaſoning on the ſubject, N°. 3: "if," ſays he, "in that order of biſhops continued from Peter to Anaſtaſius, who now holds the ſame See, ſome *traditor* in the times ſhould have crept, it would not prejudice the church nor the innocent chriſtians, to whom the Lord, providing for it, had ſaid of bad prelates, Matt. xxiii.

3, 'do what they say; but what they do, do not do: for they say and they do not do;' that the hope of the faithful, which is not placed in man, but in God, may not in the time of sacrilegious schism be confounded, as they are confounded, who read in the sacred scriptures, churches to which the apostles have not written, and in them have no bishop."

Christians, who to elude the sanguinary penal laws enacted against christianity, and enforced with the utmost rigor by the Heathen magistrates in the first ages, had given up the scriptures, or the sacred vessels of the church, were called *traditors*, and considered as apostates.

Donatus, of Cosa Nigra, in 311, commenced his schism, which spread its baneful influence like a pestilence over the churches of Africa, on the pretence that Felix, of Aptong, one of the consecrators of Cæcilian, arch-bishop of Carthage, was a traditor; and as this frivolous pretence was rejected by the then pope Melchiades, and his successor Sylvester, the donatists accused the popes themselves of being traditors. Though this was an impudent, and atrocious calumny, Austin passed it unnoticed, and justified the catholic church on the general principle.

The castigator next cites from Austin and Basil, of Seleucia, passages in which it is said that the church is founded on Peter's confession of faith. Did they exclude his person? We applaud a man's virtues, we censure his vices. Is it not the man himself whom we applaud for his virtues or censure for his vices? In common discourse we say: a man's prudence preserved him from impending danger, or his rashness exposed him to ruin. Whatever is said of Peter's confession of faith is manifestly understood of Peter himself, confessing his faith. This the castigator, must know if he knows any thing of rhetoric, which the writer very much doubts, it is matter of surprise to hear him cite Modestus, a Monk, Abbot of the monastery of Saint Theodosia in Jerusalem,

Jeruſalem, for the condemnation of popery. And, to encreaſe our ſurpriſe, his words, as cited by the caſtigator, ſhew him to have been as arrant a papiſt as the writer: "the firſt fruits or chief of the apoſtles," ſays Modeſtus, "was called Peter (a rock), on account of the unſhaken faith which he had in Chriſt the rock." In this paſſage we find that Peter was the *firſt fruits* of the apoſtles: a manifeſt alluſion to that ſentence of St. Paul, 1 cor. xv. 20, which, intimating that Chriſt is the head and chief of all the elect, and the author of the reſurrection, calls him "the *firſt fruits* of thoſe who reſt in death) *aparche ton kokoimēmenōn*;" we find alſo that Peter was *chief of the apoſtles*; that he was called a *rock*, for the name *Peter* ſignifies nothing elſe, on account of his unſhaken faith in Chriſt, the rock. That is, in other words that the Saviour, to reward the faith of his diſciple, impoſed on him a name which the ſcriptures elſewhere appropriate to Chriſt himſelf. What modern papiſt ſpeaks of Peter's prerogative with greater energy?

His next citation is from Pope Gregory, ſirnamed the Great. He forgot to inform his readers of Nova-Scotia, that this Pope Gregory, was the man, who ſent Auſtin, a Benedictine Monk, with other Monks from the monaſtery of St. Andrew in Rome, to England; that to theſe Monks England owes her converſion to chriſtianity from the moſt blind, rather brutal, Idolatry; that the ſame chriſtianity, planted in England by the labours of theſe Monks, charged with all the pretended ſuperſtitions to which Papiſts now-a-days are addicted, was the only religion believed and taught in England from Pope Gregory's days, in the year 596, until the parliament in 1533, thought proper to transfer the pontifical authority, together with all other ſpiritual authority, on that new modelled pontiff Henry VIII. of reforming memory. This ſketch of Engliſh hiſtory was not much to the caſtigator's purpoſe: it is an alarming reflection, that our chriſtian anceſtors, the memory and marks of whoſe piety are yet viſible, were arrant Papiſts during a ſpace of 937 years,

years, if Popery and Idolatry be ſynonimous, and doubly alarming to the caſtigator and his friends if they were in reality chriſtians: from their graves they ſeem to call on their children: *redite ad cer prevaricatores.*

Gregory, as cited by the caſtigator, ſays, what no chriſtian ever doubted, that Chriſt is the only rock on which the church is founded; but Gregory does not ſay that Chriſt did not call his diſciple Simon a rock; nor does he ſay that the prophets and apoſtles, in a certain ſenſe, are not the foundation of the church; and St. Paul expreſsly ſays they are, Eph. ii. "built on the foundation of the apoſtles and prophets, Chriſt himſelf being the great corner ſtone." In the ſtructure of the church, deſcribed by St. Paul, the faithful themſelves, not their faith, nor the confeſſion of their faith, compoſe the ſpiritual building: firſt Jeſus Chriſt, then the apoſtles and prophets, then all their diſciples united form that ſociety, which the apoſtle calls the Houſe of God. Gregory was ſo far from diſputing Peter's appointment, as a ſecondary foundation, that he aſſerts it in the moſt peremptory manner: "to all," ſays he, "who know the goſpel, it is manifeſt, that, by the voice of the Lord, the care of the whole church was committed to the bleſſed Peter, prince of the apoſtles: for to him is ſaid, "thou art a rock, and on this rock I will build my church."*

That Gregory did himſelf exerciſe this ſpiritual juriſdiction, which was tranſmitted to him in ſucceſſion, from St. Peter over the whole chriſtian church, we have the moſt ſatisfactory evidence in his own writings, and in all the monuments of that age: in his letter to John, Biſhop of Syracuſe, he ſays: "of the church of Conſtantinople who doubts that it is ſubject to the Apoſtolical See? What our Lord the Moſt Pious Emperor, and our Brother Euſebius, Biſhop of the ſame city, inceſſantly profeſs:"† in the next letter to the ſame Prelate: "that" he ſays, "he is ſubject to the Apoſtolical See,

if

* Lib. 4, Epi. 32. † Lib. 7, Ep. 63.

if any fault be found in Biſhops, I do not know what Biſhop is not ſubject to it.

The caſtigator did not think proper to cite from other writers on this ſubject: he has been extremely unlucky in his ſelection: perhaps thoſe whom he ſuppreſſed would not have been ſo explicit in his condemnation.

The Romiſh church, he ſays, views theſe words as one of the principal proofs of Peter's ſupremacy. The writer begs leave to inform him, that if theſe words had been expunged from the goſpel, the moſt unerring proof, and at the ſame time the moſt invincible proof, of Peter's ſupremacy would yet remain. The writer, he ſays, did not think proper to give them an extenſive diſcuſſion in his remarks on Doctor Stanſer. True; he did not think an extenſive diſcuſſion neceſſary. He has now ſupplied he hopes to the caſtigator's ſatisfaction.

He has but to add, that the metaphorical expreſſion *rock*, on which the church is founded, imports the unſhaken ſtability of that myſterious edifice, and the preeminence of the perſon thus denominated: for it is the foundation which ſupports the weight of the building, and unites the different parts into one individual whole. The converſion of the world was effected by the joint labours of the apoſtles and their ſucceſſors in office, each apoſtle was the firſt founder, or the foundation of the church formed by his miniſtry; all theſe churches being integrant parts of that one great whole the catholic church, Peter was nominated, in preſence of the other apoſtles, as that one foundation, which collects and cements all the integrant parts. Hence St. Jerom, in his firſt book againſt that apoſtate monk Jovinien, explaining in what ſenſe the church is ſaid to be built on Peter, ſays: the firmneſs of the church is ſolidated equally on all the apoſtles, yet for this, amongſt the twelve, one is choſen, that the head being conſtituted, the occaſion of ſchiſm ſhould be removed.

After this firſt effort, not to refute, of that he felt the impoſſibility, but to perplex the truth by ſome garbled

paſſages

paſſages from catholic writers, which in the intended ſenſe, confounded his errors, as has been ſhewn, he paſſes to a ſecond proof of Peter's ſupremacy. Suppreſſing in ſilence the peremptory reaſons aſſigned by the writer in his remarks on Doctor Stanfer's, p. 145.... to which the reader is referred, the caſtigator tells us that the keys of the kingdom of heaven and the power of binding and looſing are ſynonimous: the ſaviour did not think ſo, or he would not have ſaid to Peter, in preſence of the other apoſtles, "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," and then immediately ſubjoin "whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on earth, ſhall be bound in heaven, and whatſoever thou ſhall looſe on earth, ſhall be looſed in heaven. This latter ſentence is not perfectly ſynonimous with the former: for Chriſt did not multiply words of the ſame import: it was inconſiſtent with his wiſdom. The former ſentence imports the ſupreme government of Chriſt's kingdom on earth, as the writer has ſhewn in his remarks on Doctor Stanfer's, p. 145.... the latter the powers to be exerciſed by his miniſters, of whom Peter was the firſt in this kingdom. That is the power of enacting laws for the good government of the different departments of his kingdom, and removing obſtacles which impede its progreſs. A power which was veſted in all the apoſtles after by the ſame words, and in this ſenſe the keys were given not to Peter alone, nor to the apoſtles alone, but to them, and through them, to all biſhops, their rightful ſucceſſors in office, a power which they now exerciſe, and will continue to exerciſe to the end of time, though not one of them does, or ever did claim the ſupreme government but the rightful ſucceſſor of Peter.

Thus in all well regulated kingdoms not only the ſupreme, but all ſubordinate Legiſlatures are veſted with powers to enact laws, and enforce them within their reſpective juriſdictions; it is reſerved to the ſupreme power to ſuperintend them all. Thus, for inſtance, the Legiſlature of Halifax is veſted with powers to enact

laws

laws for this Province, and enforce them. It is not the leſs ſubject to the controul of the Britiſh Parliament. The power, therefore, of binding and looſing is not ſynonimous with the ſupreme government imported by the metaphor of the keys.

The writer ſays, the caſtigator was aware of this objection. True, and ſtated reaſons which expoſe its vanity, he does not garble paſſages from others to perplex the truth: he ſolves difficulties by fair argument, a ſcience, which the caſtigator, has yet to learn.

The reaſons offered in ſupport of Peter's ſupremacy are not convincing, if we believe this caſtigator, as a highwayman accuſed of robbery will not admit, that he is guilty of the offence with which he is charged, yet if the proofs be ſatisfactory to the court and jury, he is not the leſs ordered for execution. Reaſons, therefore, may carry conviction, they may even impreſs it on the mind, but cannot force artful impoſture or perverſe obſtinacy to acknowledge it. The man whoſe intereſt it is to perplex, not to elucidate truth, ſeizes with avidity on every ſhadow, which may ſerve as a ſubterfuge. The caſtigator has hitherto been unlucky, his next effort is not leſs ſo, he cites the following paſſage from St. Auſtin, in which there is not even a ſhadow to ſupport his pretenſions: "ſome things, ſays Auſtin, are ſpoken, which may ſeem properly to belong to the apoſtle Peter, and yet have not a clear ſenſe but when they are referred to the church as that is, *I will give thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.*" Without a reference to the church, theſe words would convey no ſenſe at all: for Chriſt did not promiſe to veſt in Peter a power over that kingdom of Heaven, where he manifeſts himſelf to the angels of light, and to the departed ſaints: the power which he promiſed to give him muſt be exerciſed in his kingdom here on earth; that is, in his church: What other kingdom had he on earth? Nor were the keys given to Peter to be uſed by him excluſively: they were given to him as chief paſtor of Chriſt's flock, and through

through him to all the ſubordinate paſtors for the uſe of the flock, as a privilege granted by a ſovereign prince to any province is given through the firſt magiſtrate, who repreſents the Province. This Auſtin intimates in the ſame paſſage as cited by the caſtigator, p, 44: " as ſome things are ſpoken which may ſeem properly to belong to Peter, and yet have not a clear ſenſe, but when referred to the church (of which he is acknowledged to have repreſented the perſon in a figure becauſe of the primacy, which he had among the apoſtles) :" this parentheſis, in which St. Auſtin determines the genuine ſenſe of the former ſentence, not being much to the caſtigator's purpoſe, he prudently ſuppreſſed. *Peter's primacy among the apoſtles* has a harſh, diſagreeable ſound. What folly to cite it at all! Auſtin did not confine this primacy to Peter alone, if we believe him; " the primacy of the Apoſtolical See, always flouriſhed in the Roman church.*"

His next citation is from St. Jerome, a garbled paſſage, of which the moſt material part is ſuppreſſed, not by the caſtigator, for the writer does not ſuſpect him to have read a line in the voluminous works of *that* celebrated writer of antiquity, but by Francowiz, ſirnamed Flaccus Illyricus, in his *catalogue of witneſſes*. The repertory from which the caſtigator has filled a volume, " the church, ſays Jerome, is founded on all the apoſtles, and all have received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the firmneſs of the church reſts upon them equally. Thus far the caſtigator Jerome adds: " *yet for this amongſt the twelve one is choſen that the head being conſtituted, the occaſion of ſchiſm might be removed.* In this we have a good ſpecimen of Illyricus's candour in citing his witneſſes.

But it ſurpaſſes effrontery to cite for the condemnation of popery a work profeſſedly written in vindication of what new modelled miniſters call popiſh ſuperſtitions and unprofitable auſterities. Jovinian, againſt whom Jerom

* Ep. 162.

Jerom wrote, was a monk, paſſed ſome years of his life in an auſtere monaſtery at Milan, ſubject to monaſtic rules; impatient of reſtraint, and deſirous of indulging his appetites, he retired from Milan to Rome; to juſtify his apoſtacy, and retain ſome ſhare of public confidence, he pretended that faſts and abſtinence were unprofitable auſterities, and as he did not confine his amuſements to the pleaſures of the table alone, he added that celibacy was not preferable to the married ſtate; that the Virgin Mary did not continue a virgin after the birth of Chriſt, with ſome other extravagancies, for error knows no bounds. Againſt theſe errors St. Jerom wrote the work which the caſtigator, on the credit of Illyricus, cites for the condemnation of popery! *Obſtupeſcite Cœli ſuper hoc!*

The writer in his remarks on Doctor Stanſer had ſaid: "to which of the other apoſtles did Chriſt ſay: 'I have prayed for thee, that thy faith ſhould not ceaſe?' Which of them did he order, after his converſion, to confirm his brethren?" The caſtigator, to ſhew, as he pretends, that Chriſt's words imports no privilege or prerogative, gives what he calls a plain ſtatement of tranſactions. He introduces Satan preparing to take advantage of Chriſt's ſufferings, and make an attack on all the apoſtles, "but his principal force was to be directed againſt Peter." Satan, therefore, thought Peter a prime leader amongſt the apoſtles, or his principal force would not be directed againſt him. "Satan," he ſays, "might imagine that preſumption and cowardice are pretty near a-kin, and might hope to depreſs Peter's ſpirits, as he had excited his arrogance." Satan, therefore, knew the critical ſituation of the apoſtles; he knew the diſpoſitions of their minds; he was capable, by his ſuggeſtions, of exciting their arrogance and depreſſing their ſpirits. In another part of his work we find this caſtigator rack his imagination to ſhew that the angels of light know nothing of our ſituation in life; that they can afford us neither relief nor aſſiſtance in our neceſſities. Thus he

aſcribes to the evil ſpirit a knowledge and power, which he refuſes to the angels of light. Into what monſtrous abſurdities does the ſpirit of illuſion lead men in ſupport of any opinion, however ridiculous, which they once adopt! The writer paſſes unnoticed the indecency of calling the indiſcretion and weakneſs of the apoſtle, by which it is acknowledged that he ſinned grievouſly, by the harſh epithets of *preſumption*, *cowardice*, and *arroganee*. The enmity expreſſed againſt the apoſtle, in this place, and in other parts of the caſtigator's work, againſt the ſaints who ſtand before the Throne of God, is a perfect image, if not an emanation of that rancour, which the apoſtate angels conceived, and yet retain, againſt the angels of light, who perſevered in truth and humble obedience to their Creator. Yet after all Chriſt's words were not empty ſounds: they convey ſome idea, and if they import neither prerogative nor privilege, they convey no idea at all. The caſtigator does not even attempt to affix any ſenſe to them. He endeavurs to divert the minds of his readers to Satan's wiles and Peter's preſumption, from which he pretends to conclude "that Chriſt only intended to ſhew the ſovereignty of his grace to back-ſliders by aſſuring Peter, that though the exerciſe of his faith might terminate, ſtill as a principle it would remain in his heart." In this new-fangled comment there are as many errors as lines. Men's intentions are deduced from their words. Chriſt did not ſpeak a word of the ſovereignty of his grace; nor of the exerciſe of Peter's faith; but of his faith, of this he ſaid: it will not fail: nor could it be his intention to conſole Peter under his misfortune, for Peter did not then foreſee it: it was not yet foretold. The genuine ſenſe of the paſſage is to be collected from Chriſt's own words: he ſpeaks to Peter: "Simon, Simon, Satan has aſked for ye, that he might ſift ye as wheat." From this firſt ſentence it appears, that Satan can exerciſe no cruelties, either by himſelf, or his emiſſaries, on the people of God, without a permiſſion; it appears alſo, that Satan

was

was desirous of tempting not only Peter, but all the apostles, and the whole church of God, not only then, but in all future ages. The Saviour's words, though directed to Peter, were general, and must be understood of the whole church, which Peter as its first pastor in the divine prescience represented: for this is one of those expressions, which, though said of Peter, cannot convey a clear sense but when referred to the church. In the next sentence the Saviour confines his words to Peter, saying: "but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith should not fail, or be eclipsed," as it is in the original text *ekleipé*. This prayer cannot be understood of Peter's final perseverance in justice: for Christ did not pray a second time for the same thing, and he prayed for the final perseverance of all the elect of whom Peter was one—John xvii. "Holy father preserve those in my name, whom you have given to me;" nor did he pray for Peter, as representing the whole church, because he ordered him in virtue of this privilege conferred on him to confirm his brethren, the church has no brethren, all christians are its children, the prayer of Jesus Christ must be understood of a prerogative conferred on the first pastor of his church, whose official duty it is to confirm his brethren in the faith, or as the text has it, *to fix them firmly—Stérixon*. And as this prerogative imports an official duty for the welfare of the church, it will continue in Peter's successors whilst christ's care of his church continues, and that will be until the end of time.

The castigator comes at length to discuss these words of the Saviour to Peter: "feed my sheep, feed my lambs." Passing in silence the invincible reasons by which the writer in his remarks on Doctor Stanser, p. 144. .... has demonstratively shewn, that these words cannot be understood in any other sense, but as constituting Peter Supreme Pastor of Christ's flock on earth, he attempts some silly evasions, which the writer now examines: "It will not be denied," says he, p. 33, "that the Greek word, which signifies to feed, denotes also to govern," but he thinks

thinks the moſt natural idea is to feed the ſheep, not to rule them. To this the writer replies, and he is ſupported by the ſenſe of mankind, that the one imports the other: that the ſhepherd has the power of leading the ſheep to wholeſome paſture; to fence their paſtures againſt the incurſions of the wolf or the bear; to confine the ſheep within their own paſtures, and that the ſheep are obliged to obey him, are truths which no man who has any remains of reaſon will deny. Hence the term Paſtor is uſed, both in ſacred and prophane hiſtory, to ſignify a Sovereign Ruler. Homer, in the ſecond book of the Iliad, frequently calls Agamemnon the paſtor of the people: Thus for inſtance

248.—*ōs phato neikeiōn Agamemnona poimena Laōn.*—
Therſitēs.

Thus ſpoke, reproaching Agamemnon the paſtor of nations.—Therſitēs.

The Lord ſpeaking by the prophet Iſaias calls that celebrated conqueror Cyrus his paſtor, "who ſays to Cyrus my paſtor, *haomer le chores rohhi.* x. L. iv, 28. The verbs to feed and to rule are promiſcuouſly uſed by the ſacred penmen. Thus Ps. ii. "thou ſhalt *rule* them with a rod of iron," in the original; "thou ſhalt *feed* them." *Therophām be Shebet barzel.* Hence the evangeliſt St. Matthew ii. in this paſſage cited from Micheas 8th, "from thee ſhall come forth for me, a leader who will feed my people Iſrael," expreſſes the Hebrew term *Moſhel*, which ſignifies a *ſovereign* by the Greek terms "*Egoumenos oſtis poimanei.*" That is a leader who feeds.

Though the caſtigator admits that the Greek term '*poimanei*' ſignifies to rule as well as to feed. He pretends that the Council of Trent will not admit this acceptation: "The Council," ſays he, "has decreed that no perſon ſhall dare or preſume to reject the Vulgate on any pretence whatſoever in diſputations." But the Council does not forbid any perſon to underſtand the Vulgate in the ſenſe intended by the inſpired writers, which the terms

in

in the Vulgate expreſs with great correctneſs and propriety ; nor does the council forbid a recourſe to the languages, in which the ſcriptures were originally written, to fix preciſely the ſenſe where it may not appear ſo clear in the Vulgate verſion. The council, in that decree, does not ſpeak of the Hebrew, Syriac or Greek editions of the ſcriptures at all. That venerable aſſembly, compoſed of the chief paſtors of Chriſt's church, with its firſt paſtor at their head, directed by the ſpirit of wiſdom, as an antidote againſt the contagion of error, which, like lightening, blasted ſo many infatuated mortals in them unhappy days, of the many latin verſions then diſperſed, declared one only authentic. The prelates ſaw, with aſtoniſhment, that, under pretence of enlightening the people, the ſources of life, that is, the divine ſcriptures, were poiſoned by an immenſe variety of verſions agreeing in nothing but their diſagreement ; each new teacher, inſtead of correcting his opinions by the ſcriptures, fitting the ſcriptures to his preconceived opinions, and obtruding the ravings of his imagination on his deluded followers as the pure word of God. Hence the Council, after ſpecifying the books of the old and new teſtament, which the catholic church holds to be canonical, and for which ſhe anſwers to her children, ſays : " moreover, the ſame holy Synod, conſidering that it will be of no ſmall advantage to the church of God if, of the many editions of the ſcriptures diſperſed, that, which is authentic may be known, decrees and declares that, *that old and common edition (vulgata editio)* approved in the church by the long uſe of ſo many ages . . . . . be held for authentic . . . . ." Seſs. 4°. This vulgate edition had been excluſively in uſe, in the Latin church, for many ages ; in it there were no errors againſt faith or morality ; the text was not corrupted by artifice or hypocriſy, which, under pretence of reducing religion to primitive ſimplicity, corrupted both the faith and morals of the incautious victims of its deluſion : To prevent typographical errors, and correct theſe, which,

which, through the neglect of printers and tranſcribers, before the art of printing was known, had unavoidably crept into many copies, the council took the moſt wiſe and effectual meaſures. The ſame precautions are taken by their ſucceſſors: if two copies be found different in the verſion, a recourſe to the original ſhews where the error lies: thus, for inſtance, in ſome copies of the vulgate we find this paſſage, Jos. 5th, in the affirmative: "to whom he ſwore that he would ſhew them a land flowing with milk and honey:" in other copies, it is in the contrary ſenſe: "to whom he ſwore that he would not ſhew them the land flowing with milk and honey;" this is the true reading: for in all the Hebrew copies the negative particle, *lebilthi*, is found.

If all the copies of the Vulgate agree, and that a material difference in ſenſe appear between them and the preſent Hebrew text, it is manifeſt that ſome typographical error, or inadvertent fault of tranſcribers, has altered the Hebrew text. In the edition now before the writer there are ſometimes forty, ſometimes fifty or more, different readings marked in the ſame page.

Though the caſtigator may not think the united wiſdom of the Romiſh church and of all her paſtors in council aſſembled, equal to his own, will he permit us credulous catholics to think it equal to that of the ſervant maid, or even of his better half, if he has not endowed her with all his mind as well as his body and worldly ſubſtance? We have even the ſimplicity to think the united wiſdom of ſome hundreds of catholic prelates, aſſiſted in their deliberations by the ableſt Divines in Europe, to paſs unnoticed the promiſed aſſiſtance of the ſpirit of truth, equal to that of an apoſtate monk in an obſcure corner of Germany, or to that of any new modelled teacher in Nova-Scotia. And we cannot help admiring the extravagant vanity of the man who prefers his own private opinion to their united wiſdom; and we equally admire the blind infatuation of thoſe, who believe him, and permit themſelves to be duped by ſuch nonſenſe! The wiſdom of the

decree

decree, by which the council declared that verſion excluſively authentic, which had been approved by the teſt of ages, is manifeſt on the principles of common ſenſe. Luther felt it, though pride would not permit him to acknowledge it: in his book againſt Zuinglius, of the truth of Chriſt's Body in the Euchariſt, he ſaid: "If the world continue longer on account of the different interpretations of the ſcriptures, which now are, to preſerve the unity of the faith, it will be neceſſary that we receive the decrees of councils, and that we fly to them." In the verſion with which this new evangeliſt had enriched the world, numberleſs paſſages were diſfigured to fit them to his new opinions. His additions, corrections, comments, and other corruptions of the new teſtament, are almoſt incredibly numerous: they are ſtated by Cochley at near one thouſand. How monſtrouſly corrupt theſe verſions muſt be, of which he ſo bitterly complains! Yet, from theſe depraved verſions, dignified by the name of divine ſcriptures, the deluded victims of the hypocriſy and profligacy of theſe apoſtate monks were to fiſh their faith.

Paſſing the Council of Trent, the caſtigator finds that "Peter, in his apoſtolic directions to teachers in the church, makes uſe of the ſame term: 'rule the flock of God, which is among you;' from which he concludes that Chriſt's words to Peter afford no proof of his ſupremacy."* Men who underſtand language in the obvious ſenſe, draw an oppoſite concluſion: for what is it *to give apoſtolical directions to teachers in the church of God, to rule the flock which is among them*, but to extend the cares of the chief paſtor to the ſubordinate paſtors, and through them to the reſpective portions of the flock committed to their care. Peter did not direct them to feed the whole flock of Jeſus Chriſt, of which they themſelves compoſed a part, but the flock which was among them.

It is irkſome to reaſon with a man who offers nothing like argument; who fills a pamphlet with deſultory quotations, and every ſilly evaſion, which imagination ſuggeſts

* p. 34.

ſuggeſts : " Chriſt," if we believe him, " when he ſaid to Peter, ' feed my ſheep, feed my lambs, feed my ſheep,' intended indirectly to reprove him for having thrice denied him ; and gave him a teſt for proving the ſincerity of his love." On this conjecture, founded in prejudice, the flock of this new modelled paſtor muſt reſt their *faith*, or, to ſpeak more correctly, their *no faith ;* and this is what he calls making ſcripture a ſole and ſufficient rule of faith : that the conjecture is vain, is not difficult to ſhew : Chriſt had already ſufficiently reproved Peter by that look of mercy which brought the tears from his eyes ; and which he continued to ſhed occaſionally to the end of his career, if ancient hiſtory tell truth ; nor was it neceſſary for him, who knew all things, to give a teſt to try the ſincerity of Peter's love ; he knew it. If he had ſaid, that he gave Peter an opportunity of ſhewing his humility in not preſuming to prefer himſelf to the other apoſtles ; and that by exacting this profeſſion of love, he ſhewed that he would not entruſt the care of his flock but to the man who loved him, his comment would have been founded in truth. It was in conſequence of Peter's confeſſion of faith, that Chriſt promiſed to found his church on him, as on a ſolid rock ; to conſtitute a centre of union which cements all the different parts of that ſpiritual building, and unites them into one individual whole. Preparing to fulfil the promiſe, he exacts a profeſſion of love, to ſhew, that charity is not leſs neceſſary to fit the materials for the building, than faith, whatever the ſpirit of illuſion may pretend to the contrary.

But the words of Chriſt are independent on comments or conjectures : in the natural and obvious ſenſe, the only ſenſe in which they convey any idea at all, they veſt in Peter a power of feeding the ſheep and lambs, the whole of Chriſt's flock without reſtriction or reſerve. The caſtigator, with unuſual ſagacity has diſcovered that the rams were not included, that is, he has diſcovered that a ram is not a ſheep. Hitherto it was thought that the generical

generical term *ſheep*, as its correſpondent to the Greek term *probaton*, ſignified indifferently male or female. It would appear that Chriſt himſelf thought ſo: twelve or thirteen ſeveral times he repeated the ſame term *probaton* in its different inflexions, deſcribing his flock. John xth, and thus at length concludes, 16. "*there will be made one flock, one ſhepherd*"—"*kai genēſetai mia poimnē eis poimēn.*" This *one flock*, therefore was not yet formed; nor was this *one ſhepherd* yet appointed to conduct it. This *one promiſed ſhepherd* muſt of all neceſſity be diſtinct from Jeſus Chriſt; for Jeſus Chriſt was born a ſhepherd, he was then the good ſhepherd as he called himſelf repeatedly in the ſame chapter, or as St. Paul calls him "*the great ſhepherd of the ſheep*"—"*poimena tōn probatōn megan.*" Heb. xiii. 20. The apoſtle alſo forgot to include the rams. It is ominous for the caſtigator, that this one *ſhepherd* promiſed, John xth, we find actually appointed, John xxi. and ordered to feed the flock. The caſtigator did not exerciſe his ſagacity to its full extent, or he would have diſcovered that neither the goats nor the hogs were included. Theſe, together with the rams, and other ſalacious animals, were reſerved for the paſtoral cares of the Wirtemberg evangeliſt and his aſſociates, in whoſe goſpel are found the indiſpenſible precepts of propagating the human ſpecies, and indulging the pleaſures of the table, as the narrow path which leads to paradiſe.

He cites ſome paſſages from the fathers who ſay that Peter by his threefold confeſſion expunged his triple denial. What then? Does any of theſe fathers ſay that Chriſt did not order him to feed his flock? Many paſſages more, he ſays, might be adduced. Yes, but paſſages from the Alcoran or the Hanſcrit would be as much to his purpoſe, that is, to fill a pamphlet, and perſuade a credulous uninformed people that he refutes a work which is not to be refuted by argument. In his quotation from Auſtin he makes that venerable prelate ſpeak nonſenſe intentionally to miſlead: "when Chriſt ſaid to Peter, he ſaid to all: feed my ſheep." If all are ſhepherds where

 are

are the ſheep? If all are to feed, who is to be fed? Thus an illiterate peaſant is taught to believe that he himſelf is veſted with the ſame authority to feed the flock of Chriſt, which the apoſtle received from his divine maſter, hence this inundation of preaching coblers, tinkers, &c. When Auſtin ſays, that Chriſt ſaid to all: feed my ſheep, he does not ſpeak of all men and women indiſcriminately, but of all the paſtors of the church, whoſe official duty it is to feed their reſpective portions of Chriſt's one flock entruſted to their care. Who doubts that the power veſted in Peter, and the attendant indiſpenſible duty of exerciſing that power for the welfare of the flock, deſcends in a proportionate manner to all ſubordinate paſtors? What power is veſted in the loweſt magiſtrate in the ſtate but that, which is derived from the higheſt? If Peter was veſted with powers to feed the whole flock of Jeſus Chriſt, it was not intended that he himſelf ſhould exerciſe theſe powers excluſively, but that through him they ſhould deſcend to all paſtors legally inſtituted; not to ſelf conſtituted teachers, nor to teachers and paſtors nominated and inſtituted by a cabal of farmers, of weavers and tailors, or a goſſiping party of old women. There is ſome thing farcically ridiculous in the idea, as in a ſtate the firſt magiſtrate is veſted with full powers to govern the ſtate, but theſe powers are not exerciſed by himſelf in perſon, they deſcend in proportionate ſhares to all ſubordinate officers. Auſtin therefore and Ambroſe, whom he cites alſo, were juſtified in ſaying that when Chriſt ſaid to Peter: *feed my ſheep*, he ſpoke to them alſo; by what other authority did Ambroſe govern the dioceſe of Milan; or Auſtin the dioceſe of Hippo, but that, which was derived from Jeſus Chriſt through Peter and his ſucceſſors? Why was it that theſe ancient prelates were ſo exact in enumerating Peter's ſucceſſors in the See of Rome, whilſt they paſſed in ſilence all their own predeceſſors in their different Sees, but to ſhew the ſource of their epiſcopal authority? There is not a catholic biſhop in the chriſtian world,

world, who does not ſpeak the ſame language with Auſtin and Ambroſe, and point out the ſource of his epiſcopal authority in the ſame manner. They do now, as they did then, acknowledge the plenitude of eccleſiaſtical authority veſted in Peter's ſucceſſor of feeding not only the laity, intimated by the lambs, but alſo their immediate paſtors, ſignified by the ſheep, which feed their own lambs. Thus St. Ambroſe, in his comment on the third chapter of the firſt epiſtle to Timothy, ſays: "though the whole world belong to God, yet the church is called his houſe, of which Damaſus (the then Roman Pontiff) is this day the ruler."

And in his funeral oration on his brother Satyrus he ſays of him: "he aſked the biſhop if he agreed with catholic biſhops, that is, with the Roman church."

To the many teſtimonies adduced from Auſtin, the writer adds one more, to ſhew not the vanity but the effrontery of the ſcribbler who cites him for the condemnation of popery. "The primacy of the apoſtolical See always flouriſhed in the Roman church.*

See the teſtimonies of ancient writers with the writer's reaſoning on the ſubject in his remarks on Doctor Stanſer's, p. 176 . . . . . 206, which the caſtigator very prudently paſſes unnoticed.

After remarking the *novelty* of the writer's doctrine, a doctrine which proteſtants acknowledge to have been univerſal at leaſt one thouſand years before Luther was born, and which the writer has ſhewn to be coeval with chriſtianity, the caſtigator paſſes to the council of Jeruſalem. From Peter's words, in the council, he pretends that no concluſion in favour of his ſupremacy can be drawn. It is not from Peter's words, in that council, or from the acts of the council, that catholics ſhew Peter's ſupremacy, but from the words of Chriſt, John xxi. which conſtitute him ſupreme paſtor of Chriſt's flock; however, from Peter's words, in the council, combined with

* Aug. Ep. 162.

with other circumſtances, ſuch ſtrong preſumptive evidence is drawn as baffle all efforts at evaſion: for if it be true, as Peter ſays, that God choſe him among the apoſtles, that from his mouth the Gentiles ſhould hear the word and believe, Acts xv, it is therefore true that he was the firſt paſtor of the Gentiles; and if it be true, as St. Paul ſays, Gal. i. 7, that the goſpel of the circumiſion, that is of the Jews, was entruſted to him, he was therefore firſt paſtor of the Jews. Hence it manifeſtly follows, that he was that one ſhepherd appointed to conduct that one flock compoſed of Jews and Gentiles, as Chriſt had promiſed, John xth. When after ſpeaking of his ſheep then in the Jewiſh fold, he ſaid: "I have other ſheep, which are not of this fold, and theſe I muſt bring home, and theſe will be made one flock and one ſhepherd." The caſtigator in his next eſſay will recollect that concluſive reaſoning is not invalidated by tales of St. Anthony's preaching to fiſhes. He has enriched the world with a new comment on the acts of the council. The writer had ſaid, in his remarks on Doctor Stanſer, that the council adopted the deciſion of Peter, to which the caſtigator replies: "it happened to be the deciſion of James which the council followed," p. 40. This ſpirit of divination, which he invariably conſults, has moſt groſsly impoſed on the innocent man's credulity, it ſports with his imagination, ſuggeſts a contradiction in a few lines: "Peter had," he ſays, "declared his opinion that it was wrong to ſubject theſe converts to the ceremonial law." What! Peter had already decided the queſtion before James had ſpoken at all, and it was not his deciſion that was followed! What nonſenſe! "However," continues the caſtigator, "James thought." Did James think that Peter was in error, and that the Gentile converts were obliged to obſerve the ceremonial law? In St. Luke's relation, we find no contradiction: Peter did not offer an opinion. This caſtigator does not know the force of the term *opinion*. That apoſtle had ſhewn, by unqueſtionable authority, that converts from

from the heathen superstition, were not obliged to observe the ceremonial law. Thus St. Luke relates the transaction, Acts xv, "After a great discussion had been made, Peter rose *and* said to them: men, brethren, you know that, from former days, God chose among you, that by my mouth, the nations should hear the word of the Gospel and believe; and God, the searcher of hearts, testified to them, giving to them the Holy Ghost, as to us; and he made no distinction between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. Now therefore, why do you tempt God to impose a yoke on the necks of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we could bear, but by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we believe to be saved in the same manner as they." If this be not the decision which the council followed, the christian world has been hitherto deceived. James was so far from contradicting Peter, that after hearing Paul and Barnaby relate the signs and prodigies, which God wrought by them amongst the Gentiles, he proceeds to shew that Peter's decision was authorised by the prophets: "after they ceased to speak, James answered, saying: men, brethren, hear me: Simon has shewn how God first visited, to take from the nations a people to his name, the words of the prophets agree with him"... after citing some passages from the prophetical writings, he concludes by saying, as Peter did before: "wherefore I judge that they who are converted from the Gentiles be not disturbed:" here ends the decision of the question proposed, that is, whether converts from the heathen rites were obliged to observe the Jewish ceremonial law, or not. James then proposed to enact a law, which this castigator ignorantly confounds with the decision of the question of faith, and most injudiciously mentions: it strikes at the vitals of the pretended reformation: it is well known that the authority of any one of the apostles was more than sufficient to decide the question: doctrines of greater moment and more difficult discussion are believed on the authority.

rity of an apoſtle. If therefore the apoſtles aſſembled in council for the deciſion of this queſtion, it was to authoriſe by their example an authentic form, and infallible rule, for the deciſion of ſuch queſtions in future ages. A form which is yet obſerved, a rule by which the innovations of phariſaical Reformiſts have been ſuppreſſed; a rule ſo indiſpenſably neceſſary to preſerve the unity of faith, that modern Reformiſts, in oppoſition to their fundamental principle, have adopted it. When Arminius thought proper to reform the doctrine of Calvin, on the abſolute decree of perdition, at which reaſon revolts, and human nature ſhudders; and Gomar, profeſſor of theology at Leyden, ſtrictly a Calviniſt, had publiſhed a theſis againſt him, in which Calvin's doctrine is ſtated in theſe terms: "it is ordered by an eternal decree of God that amongſt men ſome ſhould be ſaved and others damned," the preachers on both ſides inflamed the minds of the people; from words the people came to blows, a civil war was threatened. The Engliſh Ambaſſador repreſented to the States General that ſuch a diviſion might endanger the ſafety of the Republic; that the deciſion of ſuch a queſtion did not belong to the magiſtrates, who had already interpoſed their authority without effect; but to a National Council, who would decide which of theſe opinions was conſiſtent with the word of God. A Synod was aſſembled at Dordrecht, compoſed of deputies from all the churches in Europe, reformed according to Calvin's plan, theſe of France excepted. In 1618, 1619, Calvin's doctrine of the abſolute decree of perdition was confirmed, to the no ſmall aſtoniſhment of Europe, and terror of all good men, an excommunication was iſſued, of a moſt malignant nature, againſt the Arminians, of which the celebrated Barneveldt, and many other Arminians of note, were the unhappy victims. It is remarkable in this Synod that, to ſilence the Arminians, or Remonſtrants, as they were called, who appealed to the fundamental principle of the Reformation, in oppoſition to the authority of the Synod,

the

the paſtors compoſing the Synod claimed to themſelves that infallibility of deciſion, which they refuſed to the catholic church, and on the very ſame principle by which it was claimed, that is, on the promiſe of Chriſt to his church, they ſay: "that Chriſt, who had promiſed to his apoſtles the ſpirit of truth, had alſo promiſed to his church to be always with her," hence they conclude, "that when paſtors from many countries are aſſembled to decide according to the word of God, it is neceſſary to teach in the churches that it muſt be believed with a firm confidence that Jeſus Chriſt would be with them according to his promiſe." This doctrine was borrowed from the Synod of Delpht, and confirmed in that of Dordrecht.*

From the authentic doctrine of the reformed churches we may learn, not only the neceſſity, but the infallibility, of this rule preſcribed by the apoſtles for the deciſion of queſtions of faith; but the rule is not confined merely to controverted doctrines: for as the apoſtles aſſembled, acting as the paſtors of Chriſt's church, did by their eccleſiaſtical authority enact a law prudentially neceſſary, conſidering the circumſtances of time and place, and oblige all the faithful to obſerve it; it follows, without a contradiction, that their ſucceſſors in office are veſted with the ſame powers of enacting laws prudentially neceſſary: another conſequence more terrible to all Reformiſts. This law, enacted by the apoſtles, was ſtrictly a law of abſtinence: the Council ordered the faithful to abſtain from the fleſh of animals ſuffocated; from blood, and from meats offered to idols. The apoſtles therefore thought that it was lawful to abſtain from meats, which are good in themſelves: for all God's creatures are good; they not only thought it lawful, but by a poſitive law ordered it to be done. This doctrine ſounds harſhly in the ears of a new-modelled teacher. What! Deprive the ſaints of the enjoyments of the table! Oblige them to abſtain from the good things

* Act. Dor. p. 66.

things of this world! They will all turn papiſts, for the the ſource and fundamental principle of all reformations, whether in Church or State, is *Liberty*, that is, emancipation from reſtraints. However, in this mortifying decree, the caſtigator found ſomething to his purpoſe: "that they abſtain from the pollutions of images." It is rather unfortunate that theſe *pollutions of images* are only found in his own polluted imagination. There is no ſuch thing in the decree; "*tou apeches thai apo tōn aliſgēmatōn tōn eidolōn, to abſtain from the defilements of idols*, which can ſignify nothing elſe but to abſtain from things defiled by being offered or conſecrated to idols. Where has this caſtigator found that idol and image are ſynonimous? How has he diſcovered what no lexicographer ever knew before, that *Eidōlon* and *Eikon* are of the ſame import? Was Cæſar's image on the piece of money ſhewn to Chriſt, an idol? The Jews did not think ſo. Is the King's picture on our current coin an idol? Thus the man ſports with the credulity of his readers: under pretence of giving them the pure word of God, which he unbluſhingly falſifies, he gives them his own idle conceit.

Doctor Stanſer, in his Examination, had cited a paſſage from Peter's firſt epiſtle, to ſhew that the apoſtle did not pretend to any juriſdiction; the writer, in reply, had ſaid: "that it was, perhaps, the firſt time the actual exerciſe of a man's official duty was adduced, as an authority againſt his juriſdiction, ſhewing at the ſame time, that the paſſage did not bear the ſenſe affixed to it by Doctor Stanſer." It is difficult to determine whether ſupine ignorance or perverſe obſtinacy be the leading feature of the caſtigator's pretended refutation: the apoſtle's letter was not, he ſays, addreſſed to the epiſcopal paſtors, as this writer had ſaid, but to the church. He has not told us whether it was to the walls, the ſexton's wife, or the parſon's wife; but the letter was addreſſed to ſome thing, or ſome body, which he calls a church. If he had conſulted common ſenſe, it would have

have told him that a letter, containing inſtructions for any ſociety, is addreſſed to the preſident of that ſociety, by whom its contents are communicated to all the members; that a circular letter from any biſhop to his dioceſs is addreſſed to the parſons, not to the parſons' wives, or the ſextons; but common ſenſe and this caſtigator's ſpirit of divination are irreconcileable enemies. If the apoſtle's letter was not addreſſed to the epiſcopal paſtors, who are theſe "*Preſtyteroi Epiſcopountes*" whom the apoſtle exhorts to feed the flock, which was amongſt them? Were they the parſons' wives.

The writer had tranſlated "*katakurieuontes tōn klēron*," *domineering over the clergy*, this verſion the caſtigator thinks incorrect; to juſtify his opinion he adduces ſome paſſages in which the Greek term "*kleros*," *a lot*, is taken in its proper ſignification; his knowledge of the language muſt be confined indeed, who does not know that "*kleros*," in its common acceptation, ſignifies *a lot*; but he muſt be ignorant as the caſtigator, who does not know that it is ſometimes uſed in ſcripture to ſignify a *portion of inheritance*, becauſe an inheritance was frequently parcelled out by lot. Thus, Col. i. 12, giving thanks to God and the Father, who has made us worthy of a ſhare of the inheritance of the ſaints in light, "*tou klerou tōn āgion*," and hence it has been uſed both by Greeks and Latins, ſince the apoſtles days, to ſignify the clergy, as that portion of Chriſt's inheritance more immediately conſecrated to his ſervice: ignorance itſelf can hardly miſtake that from the Greek term *kleros*, we have the Latin *clerus* and *clericus*, and the Engliſh *clergy* and *clerk*. That *clēros* cannot be underſtood to ſignify a lot in the paſſage adduced, is manifeſt, for no man can be ſaid to domineer over a lot: a biſhop may domineer over his clergy, or even over the laity, but not over an inanimate being.

The writer tranſlates the Greek term "*klēron*," *clergy*; this, ſays the caſtigator, is an extraneous meaning, for which the writer's only authority is the vulgate, and

that verſion puts in the mouth of the apoſtle, a language which he never expreſſed, p. 48. To paſs unnoticed the vanity of preſuming to write on eccleſiaſtical matters without knowing the terms in uſe amongſt eccleſiaſtical writers, and the extravagance of an ignorant individual, who boldly cenſures a verſion conſecrated by the uſe and approbation of all the paſtors of the Latin church during a ſpace of at leaſt one thouſand years before the Reformation was thought of; admire the man's folly: the vulgate in this place, ſo far from putting language in the apoſtle's mouth, which he did not ſpeak, uſes the original term *klēroñ*, giving it a Latin termination *cleris*."

He defies the writer to produce a parallel in the ſeptuagint, the new-teſtament, or any helleniſtic writing. The writer knows no helleniſtic writing in plain Engliſh: it would be a curious phœnomenon; but that the Greek term *klēros*, the Latin *clerus*, and the Engliſh *clergy*, have been in common uſe to contradiſtinguiſh the miniſters of the church from the Greek *laos*, the Latin *laicus*, and the Engliſh *laity*, is what every ſchool boy knows; and if the caſtigator does not know it, it is becauſe he knows nothing of the matter; he ought therefore to remember the old adage *ne ſutor ultra crepidinem*. Though he may not find *clericus* to ſignify a clergyman in the writings of Pindar, Anacreon, Sapho, or any other heathen poet, there is nothing more common in the writings of the Greek fathers: there is now before the writer a profeſſion of faith, ſent by Euſtathius, biſhop of Sebaſte, to St. Baſil; he ſays that he ſubſcribed it in preſence of the brethren Phorton and the the rural dean Seurod, and other clergymen.

Ego Euſtathius Epiſcopos ſoi Baſileo anagnoùs egnōriſa kaì ſunenēſa tois progegrammenois de ſumparontōn moi tōn adelphōn ēmeterou phortonos kai tou Chorepiſcopou ὸeurou kai tonon allin Clericōn, inter Op. Bas.

Calvin, the moſt imperious of miniſters, ſeverely cenſured the diſtinction between the clergy and the laity; but he did not preſume to ſay that it was not of ancient date;

date ; in his comment on the vth of Peter's firſt epiſtle, in which this offenſive term *Klerón* is found : " I wiſh" he ſays, " that it never came into the fathers' heads to uſe this word ;" however, we find this diſtinction in uſe, and the miniſters of the church ſignified by *klēros* and *clerus* in the primitive church, and our fathers called them in plain Engliſh, clerks or clergy.

Origen, one of the firſt chriſtian writers after the apoſtles, whoſe works are extant, ſays, in his 7th homily on the xii. of Jeremiah : " We, who are thought to be ſomething, that is, who in the order of clergy preſide over you, ſo that ſome from a lower rank deſire to aſcend to this place ; you ought to know, that we are not immediately to be ſaved becauſe we are clergymen, (Clerici) for many prieſts periſh, and many laymen are moſt bleſſed :" and Tertullien, Lib. demono. ſays : " When we are elated and puffed up againſt the clergy," *adverſus clerum*, " then we are all one, then we are all prieſts." It was pride, in this very early writer's opinion, which levelled the diſtinction between the clergy and the laity.

That moſt ancient and venerable Council of Nice, in the twenty canons, yet extant and authentic, ſpeak of the miniſters of the church, by the name clergy : i. if any clerk, iii. if any clerk or layman be ſuſpended from the communion,—xv. If any prieſt or deacon, or any one of the number of the clerks " *Clericorum ;*" at that time there were biſhops, the council was compoſed of them ; there were prieſts and deacons, and clerks in minor orders, it was then the chriſtian church ; is it a chriſtian church in which they are not ? Finally by *klērōn* in the text muſt be underſtood *clergy* or *clerks*, for it bears no other ſignification : it cannot be *lots* we have ſhewn it already ; it cannot be underſtood of all chriſtians or the whole inheritance of Chriſt, as Calvin pretends : for the inheritance of Chriſt is one, and *klērōn* ſignifies many. Peter had already recommended to their care that portion of the inheritance of Chriſt, " *the flock*," over which they preſided,

" *to*

"*to en úmin poimnion*;" leſt they ſhould be tempted to domineer over the clerks, or clergy, as being more immediately ſubject to their authority, he ſtrictly forbids it.

The diſtinction between the clergy and the laity in the Jewiſh diſpenſation was well aſcertained, ſee the terrific puniſhment inflicted on the uſurpers of the prieſthood, Core, Dathan, and Abiram, with their partiſans, Numbers, xvi. 33. Has this caſtigator ever beſtowed a ſerious thought on it? Or does he think the Chriſtian prieſthood leſs venerable than the Jewiſh?

St. Paul has given ſimilar inſtructions to the paſtors, Acts xx. From theſe the caſtigator ſays, no argument can be drawn in favor of Paul's ſupremacy. No. Nor againſt it; it argues his apoſtolical authority. It is not from Peter's epiſtles that the writer concludes with unerring certainty, but from the words of Chriſt, related by John xxi, Simon, ſon of John, ... feed my lambs, feed my ſheep. . . . . His reaſoning on Peter's epiſtle expoſed the abſurdity of drawing an argument from that epiſtle againſt his ſupremacy. The argument ſimplified might be conceived in theſe terms: Peter directed the paſtors of ſome Aſiatic churches to feed the flock of Chriſt among them; therefore he was not the chief paſtor of Chriſt's church. *Riſum teneatis.* Such are the invincible arguments, by which theſe profound dialecticians refute Peter's claim to ſupremacy! As this is an article of their faith, and ſcripture their ſole rule, would they condeſcend to point out ſome paſſage in the old or new teſtament, which ſays that Peter was not chief paſtor? That Chriſt did not entruſt the care of his flock to him?

The caſtigator, in tranſlating St. Paul's inſtruction, forgot to tranſlate the Greek term "*epiſcopous*," *overſeers*, in the true canting dialect, and inadvertently informed his congregation, to whom the word *biſhop* is offenſive, that there were biſhops in Paul's time, whom the Holy Ghoſt had appointed to feed the church of God. As the

the ſun at times appears through the thickeſt cloud, ſo truth forces its way through all the artifices which are uſed to conceal it.

Cloſing this chapter, the caſtigator ſays that Peter was repreſented as active in the management of the church, yet Paul did not ſuppoſe him poſſeſſed of any ſupremacy. He claſſes him with James and John. If the caſtigator had read the work which he pretends to refute, he would have ſeen that Paul ſays of Peter, that the miniſtry of the circumciſion, of which Chriſt himſelf had been on earth the miniſter, was entruſted to him; he does not ſay ſo of James or John, they, Paul himſelf, and all his fellow apoſtles, were of the circumciſion, and conſequently of Peter's flock—ſee Remarks, p. 169. . . . . He alſo condeſcends to admit that Peter was called *chief or prince* of the apoſtles by ſome of the fathers; but it is evident, if we believe him, that they did not intend to aſcribe to him any ſupremacy, they meant theſe titles as tokens of reſpect which they imagined due to his character, p. 44. They therefore thought him poſſeſſed of the character of *prince* or *chief* of the apoſtles; but poſſeſſed of no ſuperior authority or ſupremacy! The writer is not diſpoſed to refute rank nonſenſe, he cites a paſſage from St. Auſtin, in which, by the bye, Peter is neither called chief of the apoſtles nor prince of the apoſtles, but is ſaid to poſſeſs the primacy among the apoſtles. "As ſome things, ſays Auſtin, are ſpoken which may ſeem properly to belong to the apoſtle Peter, and yet have not a clear ſenſe but when referred to the church (of which he is acknowledged to have repreſented the perſon becauſe of the primacy, which he had among the apoſtles) as that is: I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven and if there be any like, ſo Judas ſuſtains after a certain manner the perſon of the Jews the enemies of Chriſt."* Who could imagine that Auſtin did not intend to ſay that Peter poſſeſſed the *primacy* among the apoſtles,

* Enar. in Ps. cviii.

poſtles, if this caſtigator had not diſcovered it? How did he make this wonderful diſcovery? Why Auſtin ſays that Judas after a certain manner repreſented the Jews. Yes, but he did not ſay that Judas repreſented the Jews *becauſe of the primacy of which he had among them:* he knew of no ſuch primacy veſted in Judas, nor does the writer, if you except the primacy of his apoſtacy. He repreſented the Jews as a wicked man repreſents others equally wicked. We ſay of a traitor, he is a Judas, of a tyrant, he is a Nero; of an epicurean monk, he is a Luther. Peter Damien calls Judas: "the head of apoſtates," if the caſtigator thinks proper to acknowledge him, the writer has no objection.

Auſtin was neither ignorant nor impious: he never denied nor doubted the literal and hiſtorical truth of theſe paſſages, in which, he ſays that many things are ſaid of Peter; but, ſuppoſing, as a principle univerſally known, that Peter was under Chriſt, head of the viſible church, or as he terms it, in one place, poſſeſſed of the *primacy among the apoſtles*; and in another, poſſeſſing the *primacy of the apoſtleſhip*,* he thought theſe things were more clearly underſtood of him as repreſenting the miniſters of the church, whom he calls the church at times, as we do this day, than without any reference to the church, thus, he ſays, ſpeaking of the keys, or the power of binding and looſing promiſed to Peter: "*if this was ſaid to Peter only, the church does not do it; if this be done in the church Peter when he received the keys ſignified the holy church.*† He thus demonſtrates that the powers veſted in Peter as firſt miniſter of the church are derived from him to the ſubordinate miniſters. In like manner he thought that ſome things in the cviii. pſalm, from which Peter had cited a paſſage to ſhew that Judas's epiſcopal dignity muſt be given to another, Acts ii. Though they may ſeem to be literally ſaid of Judas, are more clearly underſtood of the Jews, the enemies of Chriſt, whom he in ſome manner repreſented.

The

* Tract. ult. in Joan. † Tract. 50, in Joan.

The caſtigator's third chapter opens with unuſual confidence. "I have ſhewn," ſays he, " that the apoſtle Peter poſſeſſed no ſuch authority in the church, therefore the Pope's claims muſt be without foundation." Facts are proved by witneſſes ; rights by immemorial poſſeſſion or authentic inſtruments. *No facts* admit no proofs ; *no rights* are incapable of proof. This caſtigator, in oppoſition to an axiom of law and logic, has proved a negative. This pretended proof conſiſts in tranſcribing ſome paſſages, which Illyricus had garbled from the writings of the fathers, and endeavoured to diſtort to his purpoſe. Theſe paſſages, in the intended ſenſe, the writer has ſhewn irrelative, or condemning the caſtigator, and cited, from the authentic writings of the ſame fathers, paſſages, in which they ſpeak of Peter's ſupremacy, and that of his ſucceſſors, in terms as preciſe, and as clear, as language furniſhes.

Illyricus's artifice was immediately detected by catholic writers, and many well meaning men, who had been duped by the impoſture, were undeceived and inſtantly withdrew that confidence, which they had unwarily and almoſt implicitly given to men, who had recourſe to every art and artifice, which the ſpirit of darkneſs ſuggeſts, to ſubſtitute their new opinions to the ſettled truths of religion, in order to form a party devoted to themſelves ; a meaſure indiſpenſibly neceſſary, not only to gratify their predominant paſſions : ambition, intereſt, and ſenſuality ; but alſo to efface, or at leaſt extenuate the ſhame of their apoſtacy in the public opinion, and juſtify that voluptuous licentiouſneſs to which they abandoned themſelves.

This caſtigator ſeems to know nothing of them profligate Monks, the firſt pretended reformers, and the turbulent times in which they lived, but what he has learnt from themſelves or their echos, Illyricus, Bower, Jortin and Moſheim. What he gleans from theſe ſources of error, he advances with unbluſhing confidence, not knowing that the artifices of theſe men have been detected ;

tected; and their errors refuted in all the known languages in Europe, many years before his birth.

The Roman Pontiff's claims to ſupremacy are juſtified not only by immemorial poſſeſſion, that invincible proof of right, but alſo by the moſt authentic inſtrument on record. Before the reformers withdrew their obedience they ought to have ſhewn, by poſitive proofs, that this poſſeſſion was commenced in fraud or force, and the title defective. Inſtead of proof they have offered ſome wild conjectures, but conjectures are not proofs, they are not admiſſible in oppoſition to any exiſting right in poſſeſſion, whether the right be originally well or ill founded. Hence it manifeſtly follows that the firſt Reformers were guilty of unjuſtifiable ſchiſm, which no lapſe of time can authoriſe or efface. To prove that the Pontiffs juriſdiction had commenced in fraud or violence, the commencement muſt be aſſigned, the time, place and perſon; on all theſe circumſtances, indiſpenſibly neceſſary to ſupport any thing like proof, even conjecture fails.

Some think this juriſdiction was conferred by the apoſtles. In ſupport of this conjecture they cite from the epiſtles of Anacletus and Julius; the former ſays: "the other apoſtles received honor and power by a like fellowſhip with him (Peter) and willed him to be their chief," Ep. 2. The other, ſpeaking of the apoſtles, ſays: "they willed the holy Roman church to have the primacy of all churches," Ep. 3. But theſe pontiffs only ſpeak of the apoſtles approbation of the primacy, not of its inſtitution, that is of Divine appointment. The apoſtles did not order Peter to feed Chriſt's flock, that order was from Chriſt himſelf. It is true the primacy of the Roman See, or rather the indiſputable proof of that primacy reſts on the fact of Peter's governing that See in perſon, and finiſhing his mortal career there: "it was he who elevated this See, in which he deigned to reſt, and finiſh the preſent life."*

Nilus

* Gre. Lib. 6, Epi. 37, ad Eulogium.

Nilus, a Greek writer of the fourteenth century, whoſe opinion Illyricus, and his echo, this caſtigator, adopt, pretends that the pope's juriſdiction over the univerſal church was derived from ſome General Council. In ſupport of this conjecture he cites the 28th canon of the Council of Chalcedon, in which it is ſaid: "the Fathers juſtly attributed to the throne of old Rome privileges, becauſe it was the reigning city, and for the ſame reaſon the 150 biſhops, (i. Conſt.) judged that new Rome, (Conſtantinople) which is honored by the Empire and the Senate, ſhould have like privileges in the eccleſiaſtical order, and be the ſecond after it." It is remarkable of this canon that it was introduced in the abſence of the preſiding legates and the officers of the empire, by a cabal, and was ſeverely cenſured, and a proteſt entered againſt it, by the legates on their return. It was alſo condemned by Leo himſelf in his letters to Anatolius, to the emperor Martianus, the empreſs Pulcheria, and to Maxima and Juvenal, Epis. 51 .... The canon is ſelf-condemned: for there is no General Council, which eſtabliſhes the primacy or juriſdiction of the Roman pontiff: the Council of Nice, canon 6, ſays "let the old cuſtom continue, which is in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, that the biſhop of Alexandria have power over them, becauſe this is cuſtomary with the biſhop of Rome; in like manner for Antioch, and the other Provinces, let their honor be preſerved to each." This canon gives no precedence nor juriſdiction to any prelate: it declares the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch to be already in poſſeſſion of an extenſive juriſdiction, and aſſigns the reaſon why the patriarch of Alexandria exerciſed a juriſdiction over Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis: becauſe that was cuſtomary with the biſhop of Rome—ſee Remarks, p. 192. Antiquity knew no patriarch of Conſtantinople. His firſt claim was founded on a canon of the Council of Conſtantinople in the year 381. As this Council was celebrated by ſome Eaſtern prelates, without the concurrence of the Weſtern biſhops, though

afterwards accepted by them as to the decision of faith, the canon, if it be genuine, which is doubtful, because it was never presented to Damasus, the then Roman pontiff, nor to his successor, Siricius, nor known to the Western prelates, could have no force. This Anatolius must have known. To give the canon of Constantinople effect, he, with Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, after the dissolution of the Council of Chalcedon, headed a party of some prelates, and continued some sessions. In the last of these, the 16th action this 28th canon was formed, in the absence of the pope's legates and the officers of the empire. On their return the legates pressed the party to suppress the canon, but could not prevail on them to do it: they have, said Lucensius, one of the legates, passed in silence the canons of the 318 Fathers (in Nice) and mentioned but those of the 150 (in Const.) which are not amongst the canons of the church, and which were made as they say about eighty years ago. To this Anatolius, and his party, made no reply. It is, therefore, true that he himself thought that canon of no force: "If, during that time," continued Lucensius, "they enjoyed these privileges, why do they ask them now? And if they never enjoyed them, why do they ask them?" To this reasoning no reply was made; the truth is, no reply could be made.

Aetius, arch-deacon of the church of Constantinople, desired to know if the legates had any orders from the Pope on that subject: the Priest Boniface read this order from Leo: "Do not suffer the ordinance of the fathers to be infringed or diminished...." The magistrates said let the canons be produced.... Paschasinus read the sixth canon of the Council of Nice, beginning with these words: "The Roman Church had always the primacy. Let the old custom continue," &c. In the copy produced by Aetius, these words—"the Roman Church had always the primacy"—did not appear: they would have ruined his cause before the magistrates, from whose influence over the bishops he expected a favorable decision; but he did not presume to say

ſay that Paſchaſinus's copy was incorrect, nor did any of his party. The ſame words are found in many manuſcripts, and in ſome the title of the canon: *Of the primacy of the Roman Church, and of the Biſhops of other Cities*—ſee Pouget. Conſtantine, the Emperor's Secretary, read from the copy produced by Aetius the ſixth of Nice, and alſo the canon of the Council of Conſtantinople, on which Anatolius founded his claim. After ſome altercation the magiſtrates ſaid: "from what has been ſaid and done we ſee firſt that the primacy and prerogative of honor muſt be preſerved according to the canons, to the archbiſhop of old Rome, and that the biſhop of Conſtantinople is to have like privileges, that he may have a right to ordain metropolitans in the diſtricts of Aſia, of Pontus and of Thrace." This judgment of the magiſtrates damns their memory: for there was no canon produced which gave the primacy or prerogative of honor to the Roman Pontiff. This therefore was a flagrant falſehood: in the canon of Nice, as read from the copy produced by Aetius, there was nothing adjudged to the Roman See; but its provincial juriſdiction was made a rule for the Sees of Alexandria and Antioch, and in the Council of Sardica, to which they ſeem to allude, though its canons were not produced, it was only determined that appeals in what is called *chief cauſes* ſhould be carried to Rome in reverence to Peter's monument. This was not giving a primacy, but, on account of primacy, acknowledging a tribunal in the laſt reſort. Again the Council of Nice had declared that the juriſdiction and rank of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch ſhould be continued, and as this was confeſſedly a General Council, and its canons univerſally known and approved, the canon of the ſubſequent Council of Conſtantinople, neither known nor approved, could not deprive them of their rank and juriſdiction, this, therefore, was a manifeſt injuſtice. Hence, theſe conſcientious magiſtrates, under pretence of judging according to the law, pronounced a ſentence in direct oppoſition to the law.

We

We know, from writers on the ſubject, that the General Council of Chalcedon was cloſed at the 6th ſeſſion, when the prelates had ſubſcribed the definition of faith, and then prayed the Emperor to diſmiſs them. They were delayed for ſome few days by the Emperor's orders, and a party formed by Anatolius, who, courtier like, made the Emperor's power and influence the inſtrument of his ambition. Some ſeſſions were held on different ſubjects, in the laſt of theſe, the 16th action, which was excluſively compoſed of Anatolius's partiſans, as appears from the ſubſcribers being but 145 in number, though the Council conſiſted of 520, as they themſelves atteſt, this 28th canon was enacted. That this was done through the influence of the Court, is manifeſt from their letter to Leo, in which, after acknowledging him to be their head, and the guardian of the vineyard appointed by Chriſt, ſee Remarks, p. 194, praying him to confirm this decree, they ſhift the ſcene, they talk of imperial ſolicitations, that they adjudge no right, that they only confirm an eſtabliſhed cuſtom: "we make known to you," ſay they, "that we have regulated ſome other things for the eſtabliſhment of good order and the firmneſs of the laws, perſuaded that your Holineſs, when informed, will approve and confirm them. We have authoriſed, by a ſentence of this Synod, the old cuſtom of the holy church of Conſtantinople, to ordain the metropolitans of the diſtricts of Aſia, of Pontus, and of Thrace: not ſo much for the advantage of the See of Conſtantinople, as for the peace of thoſe metropolitical Sees, where tumults frequently happen after the death of biſhops; the clergy and the people having no head, which your Holineſs muſt know, as having been often importuned, principally on account of the church of Epheſus.

"We have alſo confirmed the cannon of the 150 fathers, aſſembled at Conſtantinople by the great Theodoſius, which orders, that the biſhop of Conſtantinople *ſhall have the prerogative after your See*; perſuaded that you, who

who generouſly enrich others with your own, will continue your cares of the See of Conſtantinople, and extend to it the ſplendour of your apoſtolical power. It is true your legates have ſtrenuouſly reſiſted this decree; but they intended, no doubt, to leave you the honor of it; that the preſervation of peace, as well as of the faith, might be aſcribed to you. We have done this in compliance to the emperor, the ſenate, and the imperial city; we pray you therefore to honor our judgment with your ſuffrage, and to accompliſh the juſt deſires of your children ..... you will do nothing more pleaſing to the Emperor, who has eſtabliſhed your judgment as a law; and the See of Conſtantinople will, upon every occaſion, ſhew its gratitude by its union and zeal."

The Emperor Martianus, or Marcien, the Empreſs Pulcherica, and Anatolius himſelf, wrote to the Pope, praying him to authoriſe the decree in favor of the See of Conſtantinople. Though the primacy of the Roman See was acknowledged, and no encroachment made on its juriſdiction, yet Leo, whoſe conſcience was not influenced by political views, could not be prevailed upon to ſacrifice the rights of Alexandria and Antioch, to the ambitious intrigues of Conſtantinople. He replied as became the common father of the Chriſtian world: "Anatolius," ſaid he, "ought to reſt ſatisfied that I liſtened to mercy rather than to juſtice, in approving his irregular ordination." This intriguing prelate had been ordained biſhop of Conſtantinople, by Dioſcorus, of infamous memory, after the pretended depoſition of Flavien, a moſt pious and orthodox prelate, and he himſelf had ordained Maximus biſhop of Antioch, in place of Domnus, injuſtly depoſed; through love of peace Leo had diſſembled the irregularity of theſe ordinations, "this indulgence," continued the pontiff, "ought to make Anatolius modeſt rather than ambitious; he ought to imitate the humility of Flavien, his predeceſſor, and not found a claim on the conſent, which he extorted from ſome of his brethren, which can be of no force againſt

gainſt the canons, principally againſt thoſe of Nice, the authority of which is everlaſting and inviolable, and cannot be abrogated by any other Council, however ſo numerous. The city of Conſtantinople has its privileges but they are temporal; it is the royal city, but it cannot become an Apoſtolical See; the privileges of the churches, eſtabliſhed by the canons, cannot be annulled, nor the authority of ſo many metropolitans cancelled, to ſatisfy the ambition of one man. Alexandria ought not to loſe the ſecond rank on account of the perſonal crime of Dioſcorus, nor Antioch the third. About ſixty years this violence has been ſuffered, but the biſhops of Conſtantinople have never ſent this pretended cannon, which they alledge, to the Holy See."*

The reaſon aſſigned in this pretended canonof Conſtantinople is ſufficient to condemn it: for if, as that canon ſays, privileges had been conferred on Rome becauſe it was the imperial city; they ought to have been transferred to Conſtantinople, which was then, and long before, the ſeat of empire; or as Grelaſius, in his letter to the biſhops of Dardania, ſaid Milan, and Treves, and Nicomedia, had been imperial cities, yet no primacy was conferred on them, and what is concluſive againſt Nilus and his aſſociates, theſe very prelates who give the ſecond rank to the See of Conſtantinople becauſe it is the imperial city, acknowledge Leo to be the ſucceſſor and repreſentative, not of the Roman emperor, but of the Roman pontiff Peter, who never pretended to any imperial power or dignity. Nor could the intrigues of the biſhops of Conſtantinople, ſupported by the wealth and power of the emperors, obtain for them, from any Council, but the ſecond place. No patriarch ever pretended to be ſuperior to the Roman pontiff, until the Reformation gave us popes in every village. So true it is, as Gelaſius that venerable and learned pontiff ſays in his Council of ſeventy biſhops, ſo well known to antiquity, that "the Holy Roman Church was not made ſuperior to

* Leo. Ep 78, *alias* 54; 79, a. 55, 80.

to other churches by ſynodical conſtitutions, but by the evangelical voice of our Lord and Saviour it obtained the primacy."

It is, notwithſtanding, true that the Roman church may be ſaid in a certain ſenſe to have obtained authority from Councils, becauſe they have declared her authority and privileges, as we ſay that the Council of Nice declared the Son to be equal to the Father, in oppoſition to the Arian pretenſion. Thus Nicolas I. in his letter to the Emperor Michael, ſays: "theſe privileges were given to this church by Chriſt; they were not given by Synods; but they were celebrated and honored by them." .....

Calvin, Illyricus, and the century writers, diſcover another ſource of the pontifical juriſdiction over the Greeks, in a law of the emperor Phocas, in the beginning of the 7th century; and over the French and Germans in the conceſſion of Pepin, king of France: but we have ſeen the Council of Chalcedon acknowledge this juriſdiction in the year 452, more than a century before Phocas was born; and we found it inſerted as an imperial law by Juſtinian, to whom Phocas was fourth in ſucceſſion —ſee Novella 100, *alias*, 131: we found it acknowledged in the Councils of Nice, of Epheſus, of Conſtantinople; and exerciſed before and after theſe Councils were aſſembled—ſee Remarks, p. 191 . . . 206. It is true that Phocas publiſhed a law, by which he declared the Roman church head of all churches, but it was to ſuppreſs, by the civil power, the ambition of the biſhops of Conſtantinople, who, at that time, had aſſumed the ſtile of *univerſal biſhop. Bede. de* 6.

When Calvin ſays that, Pepin and pope Zachary, had combined to rob Childeric of his kingdom, and then, like two thieves, to divide the ſpoils, the one to have the temporal, and the other the ſpiritual, juriſdiction over the French, he contradicts all writers on the ſubject, and advances falſehoods as inconſiſtent with each other as they are with truth: for if it be true, as he ſays, that

that Zachary did authorise the French to transfer their allegiance from Childeric to Pépin, it is therefore true that he did then exercise a spiritual jurisdiction over the French, and consequently false that he received it after from Pépin. The fact, as related by all historians of the time, is, that the Nobles, desirous of conferring the name of King on Pepin, who exercised the regal power under that idiot Childeric III, consulted the pope on the subject, who replied: "that order required that he who possessed the power should have also the name of King," and Pepin was crowned by Boniface, archbishop of Mayance, whom we know to have been then and long before the pope's legate in France. His letters to pope Zachary, consulting him on many points of doctrine and discipline, together with that pontiff's answers, are yet in being. The venerable Bede, an English writer who lived a century before Pepin, says of Gregory the Great, that he exercised the pontifical power in the whole world;* and Gregory himself, who lived a century before Bede, in his letter appointing Virgil, bishop of Arles, his legate to preside over all the bishops of France, orders him to refer the judgment in chief causes to the Apostolical See.†

Leo, who preceded Gregory a century and an half, in his letter to the French bishops, says: "you will acknowledge with us that the Apostolical See has been consulted in innumerable instances by the priests of your Province, and, according to appeals in different causes, judgments have been quashed or confirmed."‡

Cyprian, who preceded Leo a century and an half, in his letter to the Roman pontiff Stephen, prayed him to have Marcien, bishop of Arles, deposed, and a successor elected to fill that See. The pope therefore exercised his spiritual jurisdiction in France, in Cyprian's days, that is, in the year of Christ 254, when this letter was written. Seventy years before the Council of Nice, the first General Council, was assembled, it was not therefore

* Hist. An. Lib. 2, cap. 1. † Lib. 4, Epi. 52. ‡ Leo. Ep. 89, ad. Ep. Gal.

fore, from general Councils that the pope received this power. Marcien had adopted the opinion of Novatien, a celebrated reformiſt of the time, and refuſed to admit to penance thoſe, who intimidated in perſecution, had either ſacrificed to idols, or purchaſed certificates. This unwarranted rigour produced nothing but deſpair; Fauſtin, biſhop of Lyons, wrote to Stephen on the ſubject; he wrote alſo to Cyprian, arch-biſhop of Carthage, who was conſulted as an oracle, and in point of ſcience ſuperior to Stephen, but having no juriſdiction in France, Cyprian wrote to Stephen and prayed him inſtantly to ſend ſtrong letters to the French biſhops and to the people of Arles, that Marcien might be depoſed, and a ſucceſſor elected, whom you will make known to us, ſaid he, that we may know to whom we may write and addreſs our brethren.* *Dirigantur in provinciam et ad plebem Arelatæ conſiſtertem a te litteræ quibus abſtento Marciano alius in locum ejus ſubſtituatur.* Calvin, whoſe imagination always diſcovered, even in truth, ſomething to countenance his errors, concludes from Cyprian's letter that Stephen exerciſed no juriſdiction in France. "If," ſays he, "Cyprian thought that Stephen preſided over Gaul, would he not ſay: reſtrain them, they are your's; but he ſpeaks far otherwiſe, this, he ſays, the fraternal ſociety by which we are bound requires that we ſhould mutually admoniſh each other." To Cyprian's words, which are found in all the copies of his works, Calvin ſubſtitutes his own. If an admonition without any juriſdiction had been ſufficient to remove Marcien, Cyprian's advice was of greater weight than Stephen's.

Some time after his acceſſion to the epiſcopal dignity, Cyprian aſſembled a Council at Carthage, on the 15th of May, 252, to examine the cauſe of thoſe, who fell in the perſecution. Privatus, who had been biſhop of Lambeſia, in Numedia, but depoſed for his crimes, appeared before the Council in hopes of being reinſtated. In

* Epis. 68.

the bitterneſs of diſappointment, he conſecrated a pretended biſhop of Carthage, as if Cyprian had been depoſed. This miſcreant, named Fortunatus, ſent a deputation to Rome, deſiring letters of communion from the then pope Cornelius. Felicisſimus, a ſchiſmatic biſhop, was at the head of the deputation. In the letters which he brought from Carthage, it was ſtated that Fortunatus had been elected by 25 biſhops, with other falſehoods and miſrepreſentations of Cyprian's conduct. The pontiff rejected their application, wrote to Cyprian on the ſubject. They renewed their application, with menaces if the pope did not take cognizance of their cauſe that they would read their letters publicly. The pontiff alarmed, wrote a ſecond letter to Cyprian, whoſe meſſenger had not yet arrived at Rome. In his anſwer to this letter, he expreſſes his diſſatisfaction of the pope's indulgence to his enemies; juſtifies his conduct and appointment: "there are," ſays he, "biſhops who are not made by God, but they are biſhops without the pale of the church. The Lord himſelf ſuffered many to deſert him, and ſaid to the apoſtles: will you alſo go away? But *Peter, on whom he built his church*, replied: Lord to whom ſhall we go? Shewing that they who forſake Jeſus Chriſt periſh through their own fault, but the church, which believes in him does not forſake him, and they are the church who remain in the houſe of the Lord." He then aſſigns the reaſons why theſe appellants had been retrenched from the catholic communion, and adds: "after all this they dared to croſs the ſea and carry letters from ſchiſmatics to the *Chair of Peter*, and *to the principal Church, which is the ſource of ſacerdotal unity*, not conſidering that, they, to whom they apply, are Romans, whoſe faith was praiſed by the apoſtle, to whom infidelity can have no acceſs."* In this letter we ſee Cyprian, archbiſhop of Carthage, primate of Numidia, acknowledge the ſpiritual juriſdiction of the Roman See, which he calls the chair of Peter, to which infidelity

* Epis. 55. ad. Corn.

ty can have no acceſs, and call that church, not ſimply the mother and miſtreſs of all churches, but the *very ſource* from which all eccleſiaſtical authority muſt flow; though in the ſame letter he complains of the irregularity of appeals from the ordinary tribunals: "it is," ſays he, "eſtabliſhed amongſt us, and juſtly, that every criminal ſhould be examined in the place where the crime has been committed."—*ibid.*

The univerſal juriſdiction in ſpirituals of the Roman pontiff is ſhewn with irreſiſtible evidence by the inſtalment and depoſition of prelates in the diſtricts immediately ſubject to the patriarchal Sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Conſtantinople. That prelates depoſed by Councils within theſe diſtricts, have been reinſtated on appeal to the Roman See; and that ſome patriarchs have been depoſed for miſconduct, are facts of incontrovertible notoriety; of both we have deciſive evidence in this Council of Chalcedon, which Miſopapiſt thinks the writer ought not to name. The truth is, the man appears never to have read a line in the acts of that Council, except ſome garbled fragments in Illyricus, of lying memory.

Theodoret, the hiſtorian, a prelate whoſe works have ſurvived the ravages of time, had been depoſed by the falſe Council of Epheſus, at which Dioſcorous preſided; he had appealed from the ſentence to the Roman pontiff,—ſee his Appeal, Remarks, p. 199, and was reinſtated by the authority of the then pope Leo, and received by the Council of Chalcedon. In the firſt ſeſſion, or action as it is called, the magiſtrates ſaid: "let the moſt reverend biſhop Theodoret come in and aſſiſt in the Council, becauſe the moſt holy archbiſhop Leo has reinſtated him in the epiſcopal dignity." Some Egyptian prelates of Dioſcorous' party objected to his admiſſion, ſaying that he was infected with the Neſtorian hereſy. They did not pretend that Leo exerciſed an unwarranted authority, in quaſhing the judgment of a numerous Council, over which the patriarch of Alexandria, who

then

then held the second rank in the church, presided, which should have been their first objection to Theodoret's admission, and would have been peremptory, if the pope's jurisdiction had not been universally acknowledged. In the 8th session, when Theodoret had satisfied the Council that his faith was pure, the magistrates said: "there is no more difficulty on Theodoret: he has anathematised Nestorius before you; he has been acknowledged by the archbishop Leo; he has voluntarily received your decision of faith; finally, he has subscribed Leo's letter; no more remains but that you order him to resume his church as Leo has judged." All the bishops replied: "Theodoret is worthy of his See .... Long live the archbishop Leo." In this cause we have public, authentic, satisfactory and indisputable evidence of the Roman pontiff's jurisdiction. His judgment in appeal from the sentence of a Council, at which the patriarch of the second See, authorised by the emperor's letters, presided, is admitted with acclamation in a General Council, composed of Greeks and Asiatics, at which were present Anatolius, of Constantinople; Maximus, of Antioch; Juvenal, of Jerusalem, &c.

In the same Council Maximus was acknowledged patriarch of Antioch though his entrance had been irregular, because it was authorised by the Roman pontiff: in the 10th session, held on the 6th of the calends of November, in which the cause of Ibas, bishop of Edessa, which had been examined in the preceding session, was terminated, after reading the acts of the judgment in Berytus, on the 1st of September, 448, in which Ibas had been acquitted of the charges against him, the magistrates desired that the proceedings against him in the false Council of Ephesus should be read. To this the pope's legates objected, saying that no regard was to be paid to any thing done in that Assembly, excepting, notwithstanding, the ordination of Maximus, bishop of Antioch. Anatolius, of Constantinople, joined in opinion with them, made the same exception in favor of Maximus,

mus, juſtified the exception by ſaying: that the holy archbiſhop Leo had received him to his communion, and judged that he ought to govern the church of Antioch. Though Maximus had not been ordained in that Council, his ordination was conſequent to the injuſt depoſition of Domnus in it, and manifeſtly irregular.

The depoſition of Dioſcorous, patriarch of Alexandria, in the Council of Chalcedon, is a ſtriking inſtance of the Roman pontiff's juriſdiction. In the third ſeſſion, on the 13th October, 451, Dioſcorous having refuſed to appear, though cited juridically three ſeveral times, Paſchaſinus aſked: what was to be done? If the Council thought proper to judge him according to the rigour of the canons! The Council declared their conſent. Then the three legates, Paſchaſinus, Lucenſius and Boniface, pronounced the ſentence in theſe words: "The exceſſes committed by Diſocorous, heretofore biſhop of Alexandria, are made manifeſt, as well in the preceding ſitting as in the preſent; he has received to his communion Eutyches condemned by his own biſhop; he perſiſts in ſupporting what has been done at Epheſus, for which he ought to beg pardon as others have done; he did not permit the letter of pope Leo to Flavien to be read; he even excommunicated the pope; many complaints have been preſented againſt him before the Council; he has been cited three ſeveral times and refuſed to obey, wherefore the holy archbiſhop of Rome, Leo, *by us, and by this Council*, with the apoſtle St. Peter, who is the rock and the foundation of the catholic church, and of the catholic faith, has diveſted him of the epiſcopal dignity and of the ſacerdotal miniſtry, let the Council diſpoſe of him according to the canons. Anatolius, of Conſtantinople; Maximus, of Antioch; Stephen, of Epheſus, and all the other biſhops preſent, individually gave their aſſent to this judgment. Their words though differing in ſound have all the ſame tendency in ſenſe,—ſee the Acts of this Council in Labbe's collection,

collection, or Nicoleti's, or abridged in Fleury's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, Book xxi.

In the annals of the world there is not a more authentic act of univerſal ſpiritual juriſdiction: the Roman pontiff depoſes the patriarch of the ſecond See by his legates in the Council, and by the Council, exerciſing his juriſdiction at the ſame time by the prelates there aſſembled and over them. To this act we have on record the names of 191 ſubſcribing witneſſes, not one diſſentient voice, nor have we heard of any reclamation.

Nicolas I, in his letter to Michael III, Emperor of Conſtantinople, enumerates eight patriarchs of that See, who had been depoſed for errors in faith, and miſconduct, by different Roman pontiffs; of thoſe Anthimus was depoſed in Conſtantinople by pope Agapetus in the year 536, notwithſtanding the entreaties of the emperor, and the threats and promiſes of the empreſs, and Menas conſecrated in his place. This Liberatus, a writer of the ſame age, relates in Brevario, cap. 21, and Zonares, in the life of Juſtinian—ſo far was the people of Conſtantinople from thinking the biſhop of that city exempt from the juriſdiction of the Holy See by the 28th canon of Chalcedon.

And Gelaſius, in the year 495, in his celebrated letter in anſwer to the biſhops of Dardania on the ſubject of Acacius, patriarch of Conſtantinople, who had been depoſed by Felix II. for hereſy, on the complaint of John, patriarch of Alexandria, but yet continued to officiate under the protection of the emperor Zeno, refutes the depoſition of Acacius, made by ſome ſchiſmatics, on the ground of its not having been done in Council, as he was biſhop of the imperial city. As this learned and pious pontiff diſcuſſes the queſtion in a maſterly manner the writer begs leave to inſert a part of his letter: "reflect," ſays he, "on every thing, which has happened ſince the apoſtles, and you will ſee, that our Fathers the catholic biſhops having once condemned each hereſy in Council,

Council, reſolved that what they had decided ſhould remain inviolable, not permitting the queſtion to be again diſcuſſed, wiſely foreſeeing that otherwiſe there would be nothing ſolid in the judgments of the church, for however manifeſt the truth may be, error will never ceaſe to make objections, being ſupported by obſtinacy in default of reaſon. They have therefore thought it ſufficient to condemn hereſy with its author, and declare, that whoever in future ſhould adopt the ſame error, would be included in the firſt condemnation. Thus Sabellius has been condemned in a Council; thus the Arians in the Council of Nice; thus Eunomius, Macedonius, Neſtorius. Theſe things pre-ſuppoſed, we are well aſſured that there is no true Chriſtian, who does not know that it is principally the duty of the firſt See to execute the decrees of Councils approved by the conſent of the univerſal church; as it is this See which confirms Councils by its authority, and enforces their obſervance in virtue of its primacy.

The Holy See having certain proofs that Acacius did ſwerve from the catholic communion, had been a long time without believing it, becauſe he himſelf had often been the executor of its judgments againſt ſectaries; he was warned by letter frequently during a ſpace of nearly three years; a deputation by a biſhop with letters was ſent to exhort him not to ſeparate himſelf from the catholic unity; and either to come or ſend to juſtify himſelf againſt the weighty accuſations of John, biſhop of Alexandria: for, though a new Council could not be held, there is no biſhop, who could decline the judgment of the firſt See, to which the biſhop of the ſecond See, having no other Judge, had applied. Acacius inſtead of making ſatisfaction had corrupted the legates, endeavouring to draw this See into communion with heretics, and by his letters declared that he did communicate with Peter (an Eutychian intruder) praiſing him, and making bitter reproaches againſt John (the catholic patriarch) of Alexandria, without daring to come or

ſend

ſend to juſtify what he advanced. Acacius, therefore, has been condemned in virtue of the Council of Chalcedon, and the Holy See has retrenched him from her communion, leſt ſhe ſhould fall into communion with Peter, of Alexandria, with whom Acacius did join in communion. Thus Timothy, Elurus, and Peter, of Alexandria, who paſſed for biſhops of the ſecond See, have been condemned without a new Council by the Holy See on the complaint of Acacius himſelf. Let them ſhew how Peter has been juſtified. The whole church knows that the chair of St. Peter has the right of abſolving from the judgments of other biſhops, and of judging the church, ſo that no other can judge its judgments; ſince the canons direct that appeals may be brought to it from all parts of the world, and it is not allowed to appeal from it. Acacius therefore had no power to abſolve Peter, of Alexandria, without the participation of the Holy See, who condemned him. Let them ſay by what Council he has done it, he who was but ſimply a biſhop, dependant on the metropolis of Heraclea . . . . . We have ſmiled, ſaid he, at the prerogative, which they deſire to give Acacius, as biſhop of the imperial city. Has not the emperor reſided at Revenna, at Milan, at Sirmium, and at Treves? The biſhops of theſe cities, have they ever tranſgreſſed the bounds, which antiquity preſcribed to them. If attention be paid to the dignity of cities, the biſhops of the ſecond and third Sees, have more dignity than the biſhop of a city which has not even the right of a metropolis. The temporal power of the empire and the diſtribution of eccleſiaſtical dignities are different. However ſmall the city it does not diminiſh the grandeur of the prince there reſident, nor does the preſence of the emperor change the order of religion, the city ought rather to make ſuch advantage ſubſervient to the liberty of religion, remaining quietly within its bounds. Let them hear the emperor Marcien, who unable to obtain any thing for the exaltation of the biſhop of Conſtantinople,

nople, from pope Leo, of holy memory, gave him great applauſe for ſupporting the canons; let them hear the biſhop Anatolius himſelf, who ſaid that the enterpriſe was rather from the clergy and people of Conſtantinople than from himſelf, and that Leo was maſter of it. Leo himſelf, who confirmed the Council of Chalcedon, quaſhed all that was done there anew, contrary to the canons of Nice, beſides the power which he had given to his legates."

The writer has been thus explicit on the Council of Chalcedon, for the information of theſe readers who may not have recourſe to eccleſiaſtical hiſtory. This caſtigator ſeems incapable of either giving or receiving information. His object is to involve truth in obſcurity, hence theſe wretched ſophiſms, by which he endeavours to embarraſs the unlearned. P. 48, he ſays, that this writer in his remarks ought to have proved that the See of Rome was Peter's ſucceſſor as well as the pope. Is the man ſo contemptibly ignorant as not to know that a writer, ſpeaking of the power of the Crown, is underſtood of the powers veſted in the King, in virtue of his kingly office? In the next page he tranſcribes from Raynold, a proteſtant writer of the other day, as vehement in his invectives againſt the pretended idolatry of the church of Rome as this caſtigator himſelf, and from Froiſſard, a French writer of the thirteenth century, of whom the author of his life ſays: *il aimoit la chaſſe, la muſique, les fêtes la prarure, la bonne chere, le vin, et les femmes. Ces gouts fortifiès par l'habitude ne moururent qùavec lui.* This reverend writer would have made a conſpicuous figure amongſt the Reformiſts, if he had not come a century or more too ſoon. Theſe are the Fathers who condemn Popery! In their works this caſtigator finds that popes Martin and Clement called themſelves Gods; to theſe he adds, from the repoſitory of his own brain, this remarkable paſſage: "to theſe a multitude of teſtimonies might be added, in which the pope is called: the Lord our God the pope, another God upon earth, the King of

Kings, and Lord of Lords ; and in which it is said that he is more than God, and that his power is greater than all created authority, and reaches to things in heaven, earth, and hell, p 50." This passage will be cited from *Popery Condemned* by other fanatical scribblers, as the castigator cites from Raynold and Froissard, they are of equal authority, and of similar veracity. The writer recommends a serious meditation on this passage, by which St. John closes his revelation : " without are dogs and poisoners, fornicators and homicides, and idolators, and every man. *who loves and makes a lie*—Rev. xxii. 15."

His quotation from Bellarmine only shews that he knows nothing of dialectics ; or that he does not understand the language of that famed controvertist. In the chapter which the castigator cites, Bellarmine undertakes to prove that the pope by a decision addressed to the whole church as first pastor cannot order any thing contrary to faith or good morals ; that he can neither prohibit virtue nor commend vice. This position he founds on the promise of Christ to his church, John xvi. : " when the spirit of truth will come he will teach you all things," which in the most limited sense must be understood of all things necessary to salvation. He founds a second argument on the impiety of supposing that God commands the faithful to obey their pastors, and permits these pastors to teach that virtue is vice, or that vice is virtue ; which is a manifest heresy, or something worse. The writer has yet to learn how the supposition may be justified from blasphemy.

In the next page, he either mistakes or misstates the argument deduced from Ignatius's letter : it was founded on the manner, in which he addresses that church, different from his salutation to the other churches, and manifestly expressing its pre-eminence. No protestant ever denied, says the castigator, that the Roman church presided in the country of the Romans. That the Roman church is in the country of the Romans no man of common understanding ever denied ; but that the

the Roman church preſided over other churches this caſtigator denies; he has learned from his ſpirit of divination how a church may preſide over itſelf, or preſide over no church: Ignatius does not confine the preſidency of the Roman church to the country of the Romans, he ſalutes her as a preſiding church exiſting in the country of the Romans, and ſays that ſhe preſides in charity, which this caſtigator, better informed no doubt, contradicts.

He next attempts to diſtort a paſſage from Ireneus, and affix to it a ſenſe as far remote from that prelate's words and ideas, as the moſt flagrant falſehood is from the moſt manifeſt truth. The writer does not remember to have ſeen a more bare-faced impoſition on public credulity. To give ſome colour of truth to this newly-invented ſenſe he gives a verſion of the paſſage, which favours more of fraud than ignorance. Though, ſays he, p. 55, *cum hac convenire Eccleſiâ*, may ſignify *to agree with this church*, *ad hanc convenire Eccleſiam*, the phraſe uſed by Ireneus, can never be taken in that acceptation. However the acceptation in which he takes it, only increaſes the force of the argument which he endeavours to elude: for if it be true, as he ſays, that the phraſe ſignifies: *the ſurrounding faithful are under a neceſſity of reſorting to this church*, it muſt be to know its doctrine, or receive its orders: for the faithful are not under the neceſſity of reſorting to any church for their temporal affairs. Moreover Ireneus ſays that every church muſt reſort to *this church*, on account of *its more powerful principality*, and explains what he calls every church, that is, ſays he, *the faithful, who are every where*, without diſtinction of country or reſtriction of place, *eos qui ſunt undique fideles*, he ſets no bounds or limits. In the face of truth and common ſenſe, this caſtigator pretends that *more powerful principality* muſt be underſtood of the ſtate of Rome, of which Ireneus does not ſpeak at all, not of the Roman church, of which, in the verſion, which he himſelf gives, it muſt be underſtood, as it can bear no other ſenſe. The phraſe, *eos qui ſunt undique fideles* he artfully

fully tranſlates : *the ſurrounding faithful*, which his comment reduces, to the people near the ſuburbs of Rome, or, as he terms it : *the ſuburbicary regions*. He has not told us how Lyons, an inland city in France, of which Ireneus was biſhop, was metaphorſed into a ſuburbicary of Rome, nor has he told us with what propriety Ireneus ſaid : that *every church* muſt reſort to the Roman church on account of its more powerful principality, if he only intended to ſay : that the people of the adjacent country were obliged to go to Rome to tranſact their private buſineſs : if this caſtigator prevails on himſelf to believe that Ireneus, ſpeaking of the Roman church, founded by the apoſtles Peter and Paul, is to be underſtood of the Roman State, which they did not found ; and when he ſays : that every church muſt reſort to this church on account of its more powerful principality, he is to be underſtood of the people going to tranſact their private buſineſs in the city. The writer laments his folly, and if he does not believe it, he more ſincerely laments the credulity of his dupes. Let him conſult his ſpirit of divination to know why Chriſtian churches ſhould reſort to a Heathen ſenate, or a Heathen emperor. If ever the church was diſtinct from the State it was in Ireneus's days, when the State perſecuted the church with relentleſs virulence and unremitting ardour. As the caſtigator ſeems determined to force Ireneus to condemn popery, however reluctant, the writer begs leave to furniſh ſome materials for the exerciſe of his talent. That venerable prelate wrote a treatiſe againſt hereſy, in the time of pope Eleutherius, about the year 180. This treatiſe, yet extant, in an old Latin verſion, with ſome fragments of the original, is divided into five books. In the firſt he accurately explains the ſyſtem of Valentinus, who pretended to engraft all the extravagancies of the Platonic philoſophy on the doctrines of chriſtianity ; he then enumerates all the Hereſiarchs, who had appeared, from Simon, the magician, in the apoſtles days, to Tatien, his own cotemporary. In the ſecond book he refutes

futes their different errors with great ſtrength of reaſoning and perſpicuity. In the third he eſtabliſhes the catholic doctrine on the authority of the ſcriptures and tradition; expoſes the artifice of ſectaries, who, preſſed by the authority of the ſcriptures, had recourſe to tradition, and to decline the force of tradition, had recourſe to the ſcriptures. The tradition of the church he proves authentic by the ſucceſſion of biſhops. "To look back," ſays he, "on the tradition of the apoſtles, made manifeſt in the whole world, is eaſy in every church, for all, who deſire to ſee: we can enumerate thoſe, who have been inſtituted biſhops in the churches by the apoſtles, and their ſucceſſors, down to us, who taught no ſuch thing, knew no ſuch thing as theſe (Her.) have raved, if the apoſtles had known concealed myſteries, which they had taught to the perfect, unknown to others, they would have delivered them principally to thoſe, to whom they committed the churches: for they required that, they, whom they themſelves had left their ſucceſſors, and to whom they had committed their authority to teach, '*Locum Magiſterii tradentes*', ſhould be truly perfect and irreproachable in all things; but as it would be very tedious to enumerate the ſucceſſions of all churches, we confound all thoſe, who in whatever manner, whether through ſelf-love, vain-glory, blindneſs or unſound doctrine, collect what they ought not, by indicating to them the faith of the greateſt, the moſt ancient, and beſt known church, founded at Rome by the two moſt glorious apoſtles Peter and Paul; and that tradition which is from them, and is come to us by the ſucceſſion of biſhops, with this church every church muſt agree, or *"to this church every church muſt reſort," on account of its more powerful principality, that is, the faithful, who are every where, in which, that tradition, which is from the apoſtles, has been maintained by thoſe, who are every where. The bleſſed apoſtles therefore having founded and inſtructed the church, gave the epiſcopal charge of adminiſtering

* Caſtigator's verſion.

miniſtering the church to Linus, of this Linus Paul ſpeaks in his epiſtles to Timothy; to him ſucceeded Anacletus; after him, in the third place from the apoſtles, Clement obtained the biſhopric, who ſaw the apoſtles themſelves and conferred with them, whilſt he had yet the preaching of the apoſtles ſounding, and their tradition before his eyes, and not alone, for as yet many remained, who had been taught by the apoſtles, under this Clement, a great diviſion was made amongſt the brethren at Corinth, the Roman church wrote a powerful letter to the Corinthians to reſtore them to peace, and to renew in them that faith and tradition, which they had received from the apoſtles. To this Clement Evariſtus ſucceeded, and Alexander to Evariſtus; the ſixth from the apoſtles Sixtus was appointed, and after him Teleſphorus, who ſuffered martyrdom moſt gloriouſly; then Hyginus, and after him Pius, after whom Anicetus, when Soter ſucceeded Anicetus. Now in the twelfth place from the apoſtles Eleutherius has the epiſcopal charge, by this ordination and ſucceſſion, that tradition, which is from the apoſtles, in the church, and the preaching of truth, deſcended to us ..... If, continues Ireneus, the leaſt queſtion be under diſcuſſion is it not neceſſary to reſort to the moſt ancient churches, where the apoſtles lived? What if the apoſtles had left us no writings? Should we not follow the tradition, which they left to thoſe, to whom they entruſted the churches? This is what many barbarous nations obſerve, who believe in Jeſus Chriſt, without paper or ink, having the doctrine of ſalvation written in their hearts by the Holy Ghoſt, and faithfully keeping the old tradition, concerning one God and Creator, and of his Son Jeſus Chriſt. They, who have received this faith without writings, are barbarous, as to their language, with reſpect to us; but as to their ſentiments, and their conduct, they are truly wiſe and pleaſing to God; they obſerve juſtice and chaſtity; and if any one ſhould preach in their language what theſe ſectaries have invented,

they

they would ſtop their ears and run far away; they would not liſten to ſuch blaſphemy, the old tradition of the apoſtles does not ſuffer ſuch monſtrous doctrines to come into their minds, becauſe there are as yet no aſſemblies of ſectaries amongſt them: for before Valentinus there were no Valentinians; before Marcion there were no Marcionites, nor any of theſe ſectaries before their authors."

In his next eſſay, the caſtigator will inform us how Lyons, in France, Corinth, in Greece, and theſe barbarous nations, who knew nothing of the Greek or Roman languages, were tranſported into the neighbourhood of Rome, as hiſtory is ſilent on the ſubject, his familiar ſpirit will tell him, how the inhabitants of theſe countries, going to tranſact their private buſineſs, learned from a Heathen ſenate, the tradition, which deſcended from the apoſtles by the ſucceſſion of biſhops.

This comment on Ireneus, extracted from the feculence of a diſordered brain, he pretends to ſtrengthen, by diſtorting the ſixth canon of Nice from the intended ſenſe, and the only ſenſe which it conveys. The writer once more inſerts the canon as cited by Aetius, and after him by the caſtigator, "let the ancient cuſtom continue in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, that the biſhop of Alexandria have the power over all theſe, becauſe this is the cuſtom or manner of the biſhop of Rome," *oti kai to en tè Romé touto ſunethes eſti.* He muſt be as acute as the inſtructing ſpirit of the caſtigator who can diſcover in this canon any juriſdiction given to the biſhop of Rome. If words be underſtood in their common acceptation, the canon ſays, that it was the cuſtom with the biſhop of Rome, that the biſhop of Alexandria ſhould preſide over Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, for *touto, this*, muſt have a reference to the former ſentence. If the canon had ſaid: the biſhop of Rome preſides over the ſuburbicary citiesin Italy, thereforelet the biſhop of Alexandria preſide over Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, the reaſon would have been inſufficient and ridiculous. This comment, therefore, converts ſound reaſoning into nonſenſe. This

wild

wild conjecture of Rufinus, the caſtigator tranſcribes from Illyricus, which he, modeſtly enough, gives for the ſenſe of the Fathers. The writer begs leave to aſſure him, that Rufinus is indebted to the caſtigator for his place amongſt that venerable body of men; and he laments ſincerely that this wild and unfounded conjecture is not the only one which affects his memory, though he ſhall never rank him with ſectaries of any denomination. St. Jerom, in his apology againſt Rufinus, now before the writer, treats him with great ſeverity, he accuſes him of aſcribing a book, written by an Arian, to the martyr Pamphilus; and of inſidiouſly endeavouring to introduce the errors of Origenes, whoſe works Ruſinus had tranſlated into Latin, as if authoriſed by himſelf. Rufinus, in his invectives againſt Jerom, did not juſtify himſelf of theſe charges.

The caſtigator, who diſdains to conſult hiſtory, having his familar ſpirit, like Socrates' genius, to direct him, tells us that the biſhop of Rome by reſiding at the ſeat of government had acquired a conſiderable influence. Writers of the time, tell us that his influence was founded on his apoſtolical authority, which deſcended to him in due ſucceſſion from his predeceſſor Peter. At the diſtance of ſeventeen centuries this caſtigator knows better: his ſurmiſe ſtands in oppoſition to the poſitive aſſurance of cotemporary writers. On account of this influence, continues the caſtigator, a certain reſpect was paid to him by the ſurrounding biſhops, in courſe of time this reſpect began to be viewed as an acknowledgment of ſuperiority; but he met with a formidable opponent in the biſhop of Conſtantinople. If, diſregarding the ſuggeſtions of his familar ſpirit, he had conſulted hiſtory, he would have found the biſhop of Rome peaceably exerciſing his ſpiritual juriſdiction, long before Conſtantine, the founder of Conſtantinople, was born. He has forgotten, that he himſelf has told us in the ſame page, that Anatolius, depending on the influence of the Court, was the firſt opponent. This happened in the

year

year 451, and his oppoſition was not to the biſhop of Rome's juriſdiction, for that he acknowledged; but to obtain a priority of rank over the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and a juriſdiction over ſome metropolitans, if the Roman pontiff would conſent, which conſent, though refuſed by Leo, was at length extorted by obſtinate importunity. Common ſenſe informs us that if the juriſdiction of the biſhop of Rome had been inſtituted by any Council, or any human authority, this intriguing prelate might, through the influence of the Court and Senate, in ſo great a Council, compoſed of Greeks, Aſiatics, and Africans, have obtained a juriſdiction over the biſhop of Rome, as well as over the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and ſo many metropolitans, who were forced to ſubmit to his authority. The caſtigator himſelf has told us that the juriſdiction of Alexandria and Antioch had been authoriſed by the great Council of Nice; if then the juriſdiction of Rome reſted on the ſame authority, it might have been cancelled in the ſame manner by the Council of Chalcedon, againſt this truth there is no reaſoning, the caſtigator ſtates facts which invalidate his conjectures. In the next page, 59, he tranſcribes the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon as faſhioned by ſome other ſcribbler: for the writer does not ſuſpect him ever to have ſeen it in the original, or to underſtand it if he did. Eraſmus would have ſaid: *Sentias Rabulam out Bubulcum effutientem non proloquentem et quicquid* in *Buccam venerit eblaterentem*, "whereas the See of old Rome hath been not undeſervedly diſtinguiſhed by the Fathers with ſome privileges, becauſe that city was the ſeat of empire, the Fathers of Conſtantinople were prompted by the ſame motive to diſtinguiſh the moſt Holy See of new Rome with equal privileges, thinking it fit that the city, which they ſaw honoured with the empire and the ſenate, and equal in every civil privilege to old Rome, ſhould be equalled to her alſo in eccleſiaſtical matters," here the caſtigator ſtops, his copy was moth eaten, or mouldered with age: the canon ſtands thus in

all copies which have escaped the moths: "the Fathers by right attributed to the throne of old Rome privileges becauſe it was the reigning city; through the ſame motive the 150 Fathers have judged that new Rome, which is honored with the empire and the ſenate, ſhould have like privileges in the eccleſiaſtical order *and be the ſecond after it.* Some malignant moth had fixed on theſe laſt words and effaced them from the caſtigator's copy. The canon continues to enumerate the privileges granted to the See of Conſtantinople: ſo that the metropolitans of the diſtricts of Pontus, of Thrace and Aſia only; and the biſhops of theſe dioceſes, which are in the countries of the Barbarians, may be ordained by the See of Conſtantinople, on report of their canonical elections. Theſe are the privileges granted to the See of Conſtantinople, on condition that the Roman pontiff Leo would agree to it, which neither the perſuaſions of the emperor, the intrigues of Anatolius, nor the entreaties of his friends in the church, in the ſenate, and in the city, could prevail on him to do, not becauſe the prerogatives of the Roman See were diminiſhed: for the canon left them entire and untouched; but becauſe the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch were deprived of the rank, which they held in the church from the earlieſt ages, and which was confirmed to them by the Council of Nice.

The caſtigator, in what he calls a refutation, paſſes unnoticed the teſtimonies of Epiphanius, of Athanaſius, of Baſil, the Great, of Chryſoſtom, of Cyril, of Alexandria; &c., which the writer had adduced in his Remarks, p. 197, ... to ſhew, that the biſhop of Rome did exerciſe his juriſdiction over the Greeks and Aſiatics, before and after the Council of Nice; and cavils on a paſſage of Theodoret which he thinks he may diſtort.

The writer had ſaid in his Remarks, p. 193, that the Oriental prelates aſſembled in Conſtantinople in the year 382, who had been preſent at the general Council in 381, in a letter to the Weſtern prelates then at Rome, ſay,

ſay, in excuſe for not coming to Rome: "ſome of us cannot poſſibly do it, becauſe we prepared ourſelves to travel not farther than Conſtantinople, as we were commanded by letters ſent by your reverence to the emperor Theodoſius the laſt year after the Council of Aquelei a." The caſtigator pretends that the language of the prelates has been reverſed in that citation. He ought to have conſulted Theodoret's own work to ſupport his aſſertion, and not offer a garbled fragment from Binius, who, though a zealous papiſt, as the caſtigator ſays, is not the moſt exact compiler. As the letter is now before the writer, in Theodoret's work, not in Binius's compilation, he gives a part of it, from which the reader may judge with certainty, whether, in the citation, he had reverſed the prelates language or not. The letter is addreſſed to Damaſus, the then Roman pontiff, to Ambroſe, Britton, Valerian, Aſcholius, Aremus, Baſil, and the other biſhops aſſembled in Rome. After deſcribing the horrors of the perſecution, and the ſufferings of catholics in the Eaſt, under the Arian emperor Valens, they ſay, : "ſeeing, therefore, that you, to declare your brotherly love towards us, having by the permiſſion of God aſſembled a Council at Rome, did call us thither as members of your own body by the letters of the Moſt Holy Emperor, Left, whereas we only, have in times paſt endured the miſery, now that the emperor hath conſented to the faith, you ſhould reign without us, but rather, as the apoſtle ſays, we may reign with you, it is our only deſire, if it were poſſible, to leave our churches all at once to fulfil your deſire, or rather to ſerve the neceſſity of the church. 'Who will give us wings as the dove that we may fly and alight with you;' but becauſe the churches lately reſtored would be left deſtitute by that meaſure, and moreover ſome of us cannot poſſibly do it, becauſe we prepared ourſelves to travel not farther than Conſtantinople, as we were commanded by letters which your reverence ſent to the moſt holy emperor Theodoſius the laſt year after the Council of Aquelei a;

leia ; and for this Council only we brought with us the conſent of the biſhops, who remained at home in their Provinces. We did not think that we ſhould have to travel farther ; nor did we hear of any ſuch matter before we met at Conſtantinople ; moreover the term fixed was ſo ſhort that we had not time to make ſo long a journey, nor to call the biſhops of every Province together, who communicate with us, nor yet to obtain their conſent. Theſe and other cauſes prevented the greater part of the biſhops from going to you."—L. v. Cap. 9.

From this extract it is manifeſt that Damaſus did not ſummon the Aſiatic biſhops in virtue of the emperor's letters ; but that the emperor did ſummon them to meet in Conſtantinople, in virtue of the pope's letters after the Council of Aqueleia, and when they arrived in Conſtantinople, they found the pope's letters in the emperor Theodoſius's hands, directing them to repair to Rome, which they declined for the reaſons aſſigned in their letter. This is expreſsly ſtated by Theodoret : in the preceding chapter, after giving a brief account of the Council of Conſtantinople, held in the year 381, he ſays : " the enſuing ſummer ſeveral of them (the biſhops) returning to the ſame city (Con.) for the neceſſary buſineſs of the church called them thither, they received letters from a Council of biſhops in the Weſt, inviting them to Rome, where many biſhops were aſſembled, but they declined making ſo long a journey, thinking it to no purpoſe . . . . . their own letter will more clearly ſhew their fortitude and wiſdom," L. v. C. 8. He then gives a copy of their letter as cited. It is therefore true, if there be truth in hiſtory, that it was not the pope who ſignified the emperor's orders ; but it was the emperor who intimated the pope's orders. Socrates Scholaſticus, a layman, as ignorant of eccleſiaſtical matters as the caſtigator himſelf; and Sozomen, a lawyer, who copied him, ſpeak of the Emperor's orders to the prelates to meet in Conſtantinople, which being a public fact they muſt have known, they are ſilent as to the pope's orders, of which perhaps they knew nothing.

nothing. They deſerve no credit in oppoſition to Theodoret the moſt learned prelate of the age, who gives a copy from the record. Does this caſtigator pretend that theſe prelates did not know by whoſe orders they were ſummoned to meet? We know from the ſeventh general Council, celebrated by Greeks and Aſiatics, and admitted by Nilus, that the pope's circular letter was indiſpenſibly neceſſary to authoriſe a general Synod, refuting the pretenſions of an Aſſembly, collected by Copronymus, of infamous memory, which had aſſumed the title of oecumenical, the prelates ſay: "how is it an oecumenical Synod, which was neither received nor approved, but anathematiſed by the biſhops of the other churches? Which had not the concurrence of the pope of Rome nor of the biſhops, who are with him, neither by his legates, *nor by a circular letter, according to the uſage of Councils?*" Seſs. 6. Theſe prelates, who had before them the original records of all the general Councils held before their time, declare it to be the uſage to have the pope's circular letter. This circular letter muſt have been communicated to the emperor of Conſtantinople, for without his conſent it could not be obeyed by the prelates of the empire, who travelled at the public expenſe, and drew their ſubſiſtence from the imperial treaſury.

The pope's concurrence and approbation to render a Council oecumenical was ſo well known to be indiſpenſible, that Stephen, of Morant; Auxentius, a Conſtantinopolitan born, eminently conſpicuous amongſt the Greeks, both for ſcience and ſanctity, objected that defect to the commiſſioners of Copronymus without a reply. Five of theſe infatuated prelates, who, in complaiſance to the Court, had renounced the faith of their anceſtors, that is, Theodoſius, of Epheſus; Conſtantine, of Nicomidia; Conſtantine, of Natolia; Siſinnius, Partilus and Baſil, Tricacabe, with the patrician Calliſtus, and the prime ſecretary Comboconon, were ſent by the emperor to engage Stephen to ſubſcribe the articles of faith,

faith, newly invented and authoriſed by Copronymus's courtly biſhops, in what they called an oecumenical Synod. When they preſſed Stephen to ſubſcribe this new faith, and propoſed the alternative, death, in caſe of non-compliance, read, ſaid he, that I may ſee if there be any thing reaſonable in it. Conſtantine, biſhop of Natolia, having read the title: Definition of faith, by the Holy Council ſeventh oecumenical; Stephen replied that the Council was neither holy nor oecumenical, on the firſt member of the disjunctive the writer omits Stephen's reaſoning, thus that venerable ſage reaſoned on the ſecond: how is that Council oecumenical, which was not approved by the pope of Rome, though there be a canon which forbids to regulate eccleſiaſtical affairs without him? It has not been approved, continued Stephen, by the patriarch of Alexandria, nor by the patriarchs of Antioch or Jeruſalem. Where are their letters? How can that be called the ſeventh Council, which is in oppoſition to the ſix preceding Councils? In what, replied Baſil, do we diſagree with the ſix preceding Councils? To this Stephen inſtantly replied: were they not aſſembled in the churches?—and in theſe churches were there not images received and revered by our fathers? Baſil, though a ſtrenuous iconoclaſt, admitted it. Will the caſtigator deny, what his anceſtors, on the evidence of the fact, were forced to admit? that there were images adorning the churches, and there revered by all the prelates, who compoſed the ſix firſt General Councils, that is, by the whole chriſtian world? He may deny it: for there is no truth which perverſe obſtinacy may not deny; but his anceſtors, the iconoclaſts, could not, becauſe the churches were then in being, and the very images revered by their anceſtors were there to be ſeen. On this ſubject we ſhall reaſon more at large in the courſe of this work. The writer only remarks at preſent, that the pope's concurrence and approbation of the Council to render it oecumenical was then as publicly known, and as univerſally believed by the Greeks, as that the images,

images, which they saw with their eyes, were in their churches,—see Stephen's life, by Stephen of Constantinople, by Theophanes, or Cederenus. The commissioners, reduced to silence, made their report to the emperor, that Stephen was powerful in argument, and fearless of death, which, however, that remorseless tyrant ordered to be inflicted, and it was done, with circumstances of barbarity, at which humanity shudders.

The castigator has recourse to the authority of Richer, whom he calls a learned papist. If there be an incorrect writer, who through ignorance, or vanity, hazards an uncommon opinion, which error may drag to its support, he is a man of science in the castigator's opinion, though the writer very much doubts if ever he read a line in Richer's works. However the writer begs leave to assure him that Richer's opinions are of no weight; that they have been refuted more than once, and were by himself three several times retracted. His treatise on ecclesiastical and political power would have been well received in Copronymus's Court, but would have been anathematised by the university of Paris, whose doctrine Richer pretended to elucidate, if the Parliament had not interfered. It was anathematised by the celebrated cardinal du Perron, in a Council of eight bishops, in Paris, in 1612; in this history of the Councils Richer garbled and distorted, in order to give some colour of truth to his new opinions, as all innovators do.

Christianus Lupus is a writer of great weight; if he has undertaken to prove that Theodosius called this Assembly alone, as the castigator asserts, which the writer very much doubts, but cannot contradict as Lupus's works are not in his hands, it only shews that Lupus did not read Theodoret on the subject, and took for granted what Socrates and Sozomen had said, without farther discussion.

Eusebius says that Constantine the Great assembled the Council of Nice. True, and Theodoret says that Theodosius assembled the Council of Constantinople; but

but they do not say that this was done without the Roman pontiff's consent. If Theodoret had not given a copy of the Asiatic prelates letter to Damasus, we should not have known from his history that Theodosius intimated the pope's consent, at the same time that he ordered the prelates to assemble. In the same sense it may be said that all general Councils were summoned by the emperors of the times then in being: for without the emperor's orders and assistance no general Council could be assembled, nor other assembly formed: it was the standing law of the empire, yet to be seen in the civil law, 1. *ff. de Coll. illietis & L. de Conven.* But Constantine did not pretend to any spiritual authority, nor did he at all interfere in the proceedings of the Council, over which Osius, bishop of Cordova, Vitus and Vincentius, priests of the city of Rome, as legates of the Holy See, presided,—see Review, p. 176. The castigator, who seems to know nothing of the matter, but what he conjectures from some garbled fragments in Illyricus, is advised to read the work which he pretends to refute, in it he will find truth attested by authentic history, not unfounded conjecture, drawn from materials, fashioned by arch impostors, to mislead the unwary. The members of the Council, if we believe the castigator, assert that they were summoned to meet by Constantine, in their letter to the Egyptian bishops, p. 64. To this the writer replies that they might have asserted it with truth and propriety for the reasons already assigned, but yet they did not. Their letter is given by Theodoret, L. i. Cap. 9, the writer transcribes the passage alluded to, it is thus expressed:

To the holy and famed Church, by the grace of God, the church of Alexandria, and to our loving brethren inhabiting Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, the bishops assembled in the holy and great Council of Nice, send greeting in our Lord. Whereas by the grace of God, and the help of the most holy emperor Constantine, this great and holy Council is assembled from several Provinces

vinces and cities at Nice .... The prelates ſay that it was by the aſſiſtance of the emperor they were aſſembled, and truly: for without it they could not aſſemble, but they neither include himſelf nor any of his officers in the number of the members who compoſed the Council. That venerable aſſemble was compoſed excluſively of biſhops, ſucceſſors in office to the apoſtles, and the firſt paſtors conſtituted by apoſtolical authority, each to feed his reſpective portion of the one great flock entruſted to Peter's care. It was not a motley crew of ſelf-taught and ſelf-conſtituted leaders. Hence they ſay: *the biſhops aſſembled in the Holy and Great Council of Nice.*

We have already ſeen what the Greeks thought of a Council aſſembled by an emperor without the conſent of the Roman pontiff, leſt the caſtigator ſhould think that their ſentiments had been changed in the courſe of three or four centuries, the writer tranſcribes from Theodoret the anſwer of Eulogius, chief prieſt of Edeſſa, with his companions, the prieſts and deacons of that church, to Modeſtus, the imperial prefect, about the year 371. Valens, the Arian emperor, having baniſhed Barſes, the biſhop of Edeſſa, ordered the prefect to arreſt the prieſts and deacons of the church, and ſend them into exile alſo, if they did not communicate with the Arians. Modeſtus, endeavouring to prevail on them to obey the imperial edict, ſaid: "it is an act of deſperate madneſs, that ſo few as you are, ſhould reſiſt the emperor, who governs ſo many and ſuch mighty nations: As no one replied the prefect ſpoke to Eulogius, the chief prieſt, a man worthy of everlaſting praiſe? What? Doſt thou not anſwer to what I have ſaid to thee? Verily, replied Eulogius, I did not think it my duty to anſwer when I was not aſked the queſtion. I have beſtowed many words, ſaid the prefect, to adviſe you for your good. Your ſpeech, replied Eulogius, was addreſſed to us all, I did not think it right to prevent my companions, and anſwer alone, but if it be your will to

aſk me any thing, I ſhall tell you my mind. Then, ſaid the prefect, communicate with the emperor. To this Eulogious pleaſantly replied: What? Is my lord the emperor, beſides the empire, become a prieſt? That is, with the imperial dignity has he received the prieſthood alſo?" That this their opinion was univerſally believed by catholics we know, becauſe it was never cenſured; becauſe it was approved and applauded. Theodoret continues: the prefect apprehended eighty of them, and ſent them away into Thrace. As they were led into exile great honor was done them on the way: cities and towns came in proceſſion to meet them.... L. iv, C. 16.

The writer begs leave to inſert the preceding chapter by way of digreſſion. In it the reader will ſee how deeply the then Chriſtian world was immerſed in what are now called popiſh ſuperſtitions.

As to Barſes, (B) whoſe glory ſtill continues not only in Edeſſa, which city he governed, and in the neighbouring cities, but alſo in Phenicia, Egypt and Thebais, for the fame of his virtues had been heard in all theſe countries. Valens firſt aſſigned him Aradus, an iſland, for his dwelling place; but when he underſtood that an immenſe number of people flocked about him there, for he was endued with apoſtolical grace, and cured diſeaſes by his word only, the emperor removed him thence to Oxyrineus, a city in Egypt. Again when his fame attracted multitudes he ſent him to a caſtle called Phenas, ſituate in the utmoſt boundary of that country, bordering on the ſavage people who dwell there. Thither Valens tranſported this aged father, who, God knows, was more fit to be a citizen of the kingdom of heaven. *It is ſaid that his bed remains yet in Aradus to this preſent day, and is greatly honored by the people. For many vexed with diſeaſes after having lain upon it, are by faith reſtored to their perfect health*,—L. iv, C. 15. This is one of theſe Fathers whom the caſtigator cites for the condemnation of popery!

From the Council of Nice, in 325, the caſtigator deſcends

cends to the Council of Conſtance, in 1414. He forgot to inform his readers of Nova-Scotia, that in the intermediate ſpace of 1089 years there were fourteen general Councils aſſembled, all compoſed of popiſh biſhops, whoſe acts are yet on record, ſo many ſubſcribing witneſſes that this popery, which he hates, was during that ſpace of time the religion of the Chriſtian world. If he had read the hiſtory of the Council of Conſtance, he would have found that Martin V. who approved the doctrinal decrees of that Council, ſeverely cenſured the unwarranted aſſumption of ſome prelates, who qualified their private regulations, as the genuine acts of a general Council. It is rather ſtrange that this caſtigator ſhould ſeek protection from the Council of Conſtance. The reader muſt admire the accuracy of his hiſtorian; he gives the exact number of barbers, of muſicians, of ſtrumpets and jugglers, who were preſent at the Council. With theſe his author ſeems to be well acquainted. He has not told us how many burghers, or anti-burghers were there. Were they claſſed with the jugglers or non-deſcripts? He laments the fate of *John Huſs*, and *Jerome of Prague*, who taught the way to heaven according to the ſcriptures; ſo did *Jack Straw*, and *Wat Tyler*, *John Ball*, *George Gordon*, and many other military divines, who received from the gratitude of an Engliſh jury, the reward of their pious labours. See the hiſtory of John Huſs and the Council of Conſtance, *Review*, p. 55 . . . . 70.

He next attempts to elude the authority of Epiphanius, who ſays that Urſacius, biſhop of Singidon, and Valens, biſhop of Murcia, went with ſupplicatory libels to Julius, biſhop of Rome, to give an account of their error and their crimes. His ridiculous effort to elude the force of this teſtimony only ſtrengthens it. For if it be true, as he ſays, p. 68, that they had already been abſolved by the Council of Milan, and then went to repeat their recantation before pope Julius, thinking if they could obtain his countenance it would efface every ſuſpicion

picion againſt them, it is therefore true that they thought the pope's authority ſuperior to that of the Council. This, however, he does not think any acknowledgment of ſupremacy. Men who judge by the rules of common ſenſe think otherwiſe; Athanaſius, Theodoret, and Chryſoſtom, Greek prelates of venerable memory, who had appealed from the judgments of Councils to the Holy See, thought ſo too—See their appeals, *Remarks*, p. 197. The Council of *Sardica*, compoſed of biſhops aſſembled from all parts of the then Chriſtian world, were of the ſame opinion.

From the following extract of their Synodical Letter, given by Theodoret, *Lib.* ii. *Cap.* 8, the reader will ſee what was the received doctrine of the Chriſtian world, on the Roman pontiff's ſupremacy, in them early days, whilſt the apoſtles inſtructions were yet freſh in the memory of their diſciples:

EXTRACT—

"The Holy Council held at *Sardica*, through the grace of God, by the biſhops of *Rome*, of *Spain*, of *France*, of *Italy*, of *Campania*, of *Calabria*, of *Africa*, of *Sardinia*, of *Pannonia*, of *Myſia*, of *Dacia*, of *Dardania*, of lower *Dacia*, of *Macedonia*, of *Theſſaly*, of *Achaia*, of *Epirus*, of *Thracia*, of *Rhodes*, of *Aſia*, of *Caria*, of *Bithynia*, of *Helleſpont*, of *Phrygia*, of *Piſidia*, of *Cappadocia*, of *Pontus*, of *Phrygia* the leſs, of *Celica*, of *Pamphylia*, of *Lydia*, of the Iſlands of the *Cyclades*, of *Egypt*, of *Thebais*, of *Libia*, of *Galatia*, of *Paleſtine*, of *Arabia*, to all biſhops . . . greeting . . . . . *Euſebius*, *Maris*, *Theodorus*, *Theogius*, *Urſacius*, *Valens*, *Menaphantus*, and *Stephen*, have written to our fellow in office, *Julius*, biſhop of the Church of *Rome*, againſt our fellow biſhops *Athanaſius*, *Marcellus*, and *Aſclephas*, ſo alſo the biſhops of the oppoſite party have written to him, both to atteſt the juſtice and innocence of our fellow biſhop *Athanaſius*, and to declare that the report of the Euſebians contained nothing but falſehood and ſlander, their accuſations are known to the world to be manifeſtly falſe, as well becauſe they would not appear when

when they were cited by our moſt dear brother and fellow biſhop *Julius*, as by the letters which Julius wrote; for they would undoubtedly have appeared, if they had been able to juſtify before Julius the crimes which they had committed againſt theſe biſhops." . . . .

Here we have the teſtimony, not of an individual, but of the civilized world, that accuſations and appeals were brought before the Roman pontiff before the Council of Sardica was aſſembled; that Council, therefore, only declared the exiſting law when they ſaid, *Canon* 7, *Let.* 5, *Gr.* "when a biſhop, depoſed by a provincial Council, ſhall have appealed, and recur to the biſhop of Rome, if he thinks proper that the affair ſhould be examined anew, he will write to the biſhops of the neighbouring Province, that they may be judges of the matter; and if the depoſed biſhop, engage the biſhop of Rome to ſend a prieſt from near his perſon, he may do it, and ſend commiſſioners, to judge, by his authority, with the biſhops, but if he thinks the biſhops ſufficient to terminate the matter, he will do what his wiſdom will ſuggeſt."

This Council of Sardica does not meet the caſtigator's approbation, that is not ſurpriſing: for in their Synodical Letter, to Pope Julius, they ſay: "it is meet that Biſhops ſhould bring from all ſides, matters to the head of the church," that is, to the See of St. Peter.

In the ſimplicity of the times it was thought, that the Pope was head of the Church, and the See of Rome, the See of St. Peter. Fleury, who was not remarkably prejudiced in favor of the Roman See, cites this letter, B. xii. s. 3, 6. Though the caſtigator may refuſe his approbation, the Council has been approved by Theodoret, a Greek writer of venerable memory; by Athanaſius, patriarch of Alexandria, a writer univerſally admired by Greeks and Latins: he ſays, in his ſecond Apology, that the Council was ſubſcribed by more than three hundred Biſhops, ſo does Hilary, Lib. de Synodis, Sulpitius, B. ii. Va. His. ſays it was a Convocation of the whole world, and Socrates Scholaſticus, B. ii. cap. 16, calls it a General Council;

Council; in a word, its doctrine and discipline had the approbation of the then catholic world, was disaproved by none but professed Arians; and it has been of such venerable authority, that the century writers of Magdeburg, of reforming memory, have described it as a lawful Synod, Cent. 4, cap. 9. Even the castigator himself, if he had read their Synodical Letter, would have found some passages more to his purpose than many of these garbled quotations, which swell his pamphlet to an immoderate size: for they say: "the most holy Emperors have called us from different provinces and cities, and have appointed this holy Council to meet at Sardica,"..... and they call the Roman pontiff Julius "their beloved brother and fellow bishop" which the castigator thinks sufficient to shew that they acknowledged no primacy or supremacy in him. Thus he pretends to elude the argument drawn from the Councils of Ephesus, and ii. of Nice. Because these Councils called the Roman pontiff their fellow bishop, he thinks they did not acknowledge him as their head. By the same reasoning he would have found that St. Paul did not acknowledge the supremacy of Jesus Christ, for he calls him "*Minister of the circumcision*," Rom. xv, 8. and "*Apostle*," Heb. iii. 1. It is rather unfortunate that the acts of these Councils are yet in being; and that we are not left to conjecture their thoughts from garbled and distorted passages, or take for genuine the sense which imposture affixes to them; we see that the Council of Sardica, whilst it calls Julius fellow bishop, says that he cited so many prelates to justify their charges against the patriarch of Alexandria; and severely censures them for not appearing.

He next has recourse to his friend Dupin, who knows, as the castigator pretends, that a letter from Athanasius to the anti-pope Felix, whom Athanasius at the time of writing thought duly elected, is not genuine: it has been already remarked that Dupin retracted his errors and his impertinent conjectures. His impudent strictures

on

on the primitive Fathers, and other eccleſiaſtical writers, were founded on weighty reaſons, if there be weight in gold: for when he was arreſted on ſuſpicion of carrying on a treaſonable correſpondence with a moſt reverend prelate of a neighbouring State, on the 10th of February, 1719. and his papers examined at the Palais Royal, it appeared that he was not guilty of treaſon againſt the State, for which he would have paid the forfeit of his life; but againſt the Church, of which, Cranmer like, he profeſſed himſelf a member, and from which he drew an honorable and comfortable ſubſiſtence. Laſſitau, biſhop of Siſteron, who was preſent at the examination of his papers, gives a catalogue of errors, little inferior to Luther's dreams, which that lurking hypocrite inſidiouſly endeavoured to diſſeminate. However, whether on conviction of conſcience, or through fear of loſing his appointments, all theſe he retracted and anathematized, died in the communion of the church. Peace to his manes. It is not from him that the caſtigator learned that this pope Felix, whom Athanaſius, hearing the irregularity of his election, called a wolf, is revered by Catholics as a ſaint and martyr. Felix, the ſaint and martyr, governed the church from the year 269 to 275, and ſuffered under the Heathen emperor Aurelian. Felix, the anti-pope, as Fleury calls him, was intruded into the See of Liberius, then in exile, by the artifices of the Arian emperor Conſtantius, in the year 355, near a century after the martyr's death. This caſtigator ſpeaks of ſaints and popes as a blind man does of colours.

He finds that Athanaſius had great reaſons to acknowledge the pope's ſupremacy, becauſe Sozomen and Socrates Scholaſticus ſay that Julius, biſhop of Rome, had reſtored him to the See of Alexandria, p. 71. However, he thinks, they were both miſtaken, he was, ſays he, reſtored by the Council of Sardica, many years after, *ibid.* As the *ignis fatuus* leads the benighted traveller to the precipice, ſo his ſpirit of divination leads this caſtigator

caſtigator to his ruin: from his ſtatement we have that Athanaſius, patriarch of the ſecond See, a Greek prelate, univerſally acknowledged orthodox, and Sozomen, with Socrates Scholaſticus, Greek lawyers, not much prejudiced in favor of the Roman See, as is manifeſt from their works, believed the biſhop of Rome poſſeſſed of powers to reinſtate a biſhop depoſed by a Council, before the Council of Sardica was aſſembled: the right, therefore, of judging on appeals was veſted in the Roman pontiff before the Council of Sardica declared it. Thus the caſtigator refutes himſelf. The writer begs leave to vindicate Socrates and Sozomen in the preſent inſtance. For their private conjectures and opinions he has no reſpect; but facts of public notoriety they muſt have known: when, therefore they ſay that pope Julius reinſtated Athanaſius in his See of Alexandria. they are to be underſtood of his ſpiritual authority and juriſdiction over that patriarchal See, and the many epiſcopal Sees dependant on it. In this they were not miſtaken. They did not pretend that Julius reinſtated him in poſſeſſion of the cathedral of Alexandria, or the temporalities belonging to it: the Arian emperor Conſtantius would not permit him. To this firſt error the caſtigator adds a ſecond: The Council of Sardica did not, as he pretends, reſtore Athanaſius to the poſſeſſion of his See in Alexandria. The Council had no more juriſdiction over the city of Alexandria than the pope. They declared Athanaſius innocent of the crimes, with which he was charged by the Arians, and rightful biſhop of that patriarchal See, as the pope had done before. For the poſſeſſion of his See, Athanaſius was not indebted to the Pope or the Council, but to the protection of Conſtans, Emperor of the Weſt, and the fears of Conſtantius, his brother in the Eaſt. Theodoret ſays, Lib. ii, Cap. 8, that after the Council of Sardica, Conſtans ſent a menacing letter by two of the biſhops, in company with General Salionus, to his brother, deſiring "that he would ſend Athanaſius home to his flock."

in

in conſequence, Conſtantius wrote the following letter to that prelate:

LETTER—

Conſtantius, the victorious emperor, to Athanaſius, greeting:

Though we informed you by a former letter that you might come to our Court with full confidence, as it was our pleaſure to ſend you home to your See, we have, notwithſtanding, directed this letter alſo to your reverence, willing you to take a public carriage and come hither to us haſtily without fear or diſtruſt, to the end that you may enjoy what you deſire, *ibid.* Cap. 11°.

If Athanaſius had been a temporiſing biſhop of the modern ſchool, he had great reaſons to acknowledge, not the pope's ſupremacy, as the caſtigator pretends, but the emperor's: for from the pope, who neither poſſeſſed nor claimed any temporal juriſdiction, even in Rome, he could not expect to be reinſtated in his cathedral of Alexandria: that was dependant on the emperor's mandate.

Thus the caſtigator, making a diſplay of erudition, with ſome ſcraps of garbled hiſtory, tranſcribed from Illyricus, injudiciouſly informs his admirers, that in primitive times Chriſtian churches were governed by biſhops in regular ſucceſſion. Is that a Chriſtian church in which there is neither biſhop, nor ſucceſſion of biſhops? In what does it reſemble the churches in Aſia and Europe, founded and governed by the apoſtles and their immediate ſucceſſors? Is it not an intuitive truth, independant on diſcuſſion, that if they taught chriſtianity in its purity, the caſtigator does not. That highly poliſhed church, of which he profeſſes himſelf a miniſter, by reforming reformation, has reformed chriſtianity to a non-entity.

From the facts already ſtated authentic, if there be truth in man, we learn that in the early times Chriſtian princes neither exerciſed nor claimed, neither poſſeſſed, nor were thought to poſſeſs, any ſpiritual juriſdiction or

authority whatſoever; that the ſupreme ſpiritual authority was univerſally believed to reſide in the Roman pontiff, Peter's ſucceſſor; that he neither exerciſed nor claimed, neither poſſeſſed, nor was thought to poſſeſs, any civil authority or temporal juriſdiction whatever.

The reader muſt admire the caſtigator's ſagacity: in a fact ſimply and truly ſtated he detects proofs of *the moſt contemptible ignorance.* The writer, in his remarks on Doctor Stanſer's examination, had ſaid that the Roman pontiff Victor, in the year 192, had threatened to excommunicate ſome Aſiatics, for celebrating the feſtival of Eaſter on the 14th day of the March moon. The fact the caſtigator admits; he cites a long paſſage from Socrates the hiſtorian, in which it is expreſsly ſaid, that Victor did ſend an excommunication libel againſt them; but he diſcovers the writer's ignorance in trying to perſuade his readers that to celebrate the feſtival of Eaſter on the 14th day of the March moon, whatever day it happened was an innovation in religion. If the writer had called it an error in faith, or innovation in religion, a man of leſs ſagacity than the caſtigator would have qualified it artifice or impoſture, the latent ignorance would have eſcaped his notice. With equal ſagacity, he has diſcovered that this writer is not better informed about the nature of excommunication, as it was frequently uſed in primitive ages, p. 74: a ſubject which the writer had not diſcuſſed at all. If the caſtigator will diſcard that lying ſpirit of divination, which deceives him ſo invariably, he will find that in the ſtatement there is neither ignorance, artifice nor impoſture. The Council of Nice, that venerable aſſembly of catholic biſhops, of tried faith, unſhaken by the tempeſt of perſecution, againſt whom the laſt efforts of the powers of darkneſs were ineffectual, condemned that uſage, not as an error in faith, or innovation in religion, but as an erroneous and unwarranted deviation from general diſcipline; and what the caſtigator, with modeſty ſurpaſſing his ſagacity, calls a *nonſenſical rite*, was one of the principal

cauſes

cauſes of aſſembling that great Council. The prelates in their Synodical Letter ſay: "as to our conſent for the celebration of the moſt holy feſtival of Eaſter, we give you to underſtand, that the controverſy raiſed on that ſubject, was, through your good prayers, well and diſcreetly ſettled, ſo that all the brethren, who dwell in the Eaſt, and in times paſt, followed the obſervation of the *Jews* in keeping the feaſt of Eaſter, are now determined in future, to follow the *Romans*, who *always from the beginning* have kept it as we have done," Theo. B. i, C. 9. In the next chapter the hiſtorian gives the letter of Conſtantine the Great, to the biſhops in his empire, who were not preſent at the Council. As many readers have not a familiar ſpirit to conſult, and few underſtand the language of a Greek hiſtorian, the writer begs leave to give that prince's letter in plain Engliſh; in it his reader will ſee how deeply immerſed in the popiſh ſuperſtitions of obſerving the *nonſenſical rites* of feaſts and faſts, the whole Chriſtian world was in the days of that firſt and greateſt of Chriſtian Emperors:

LETTER—

"Conſtantine Emperor, to the churches greeting:

Whereas the flouriſhing and proſperous ſtate of the common wealth, is to us manifeſt proof of the ſpecial grace and favour of God, it has been always our chief care to have *one faith*, unfeigned charity, and general agreement in religion and worſhip of God preſerved amongſt all people of the Catholic church; but as this could not be well accompliſhed, unleſs all the biſhops, or a great majority of them were aſſembled, that each might ſeverally give his judgment in the cauſes of religion, hence after as many as poſſibly might, were met together, I myſelf, as one of your number, was preſent alſo, for I did not refuſe to unite myſelf with you in that ſervice, of which I am exceedingly glad; ſo long every queſtion was exactly diſcuſſed, until ſuch ſentence was pronounced, as God, the beholder of all things, by the union and conſent of minds, was pleaſed to permit;

ſo

ſo that nothing was left which concerns diſagreement of mind or controverſy of religion.

When the queſtion was moved concerning the moſt holy feaſt of Eaſter, it was agreed by common conſent that all Chriſtians ſhould obſerve it on the ſame day. For what is more laudable or honorable than that his feaſt, by which the hope of immortal life is offered to us, ſhould be obſerved by all in the ſame manner? It ſeemed ſhameful and diſhonorable to us to follow the cuſtom of the Jews in keeping that ſacred feſtival, who, for that great and horrible crime of ſhedding our Saviour's blood, are juſtly blinded with error and ignorance; we are left free to reject their cuſtom, and to tranſmit to poſterity a more true manner of obſerving the feaſt *which we have retained from the day of our Saviour's paſſion to this preſent time*, therefore, let us have no fellowſhip nor communion with the accurſed Jews. Our Saviour has taught us to walk in a different path from theirs, and that courſe which is purſued by the profeſſors of our religion is both lawful and becoming. Let us therefore all unite and unanimouſly adhere to it, moſt venerable brethren, and ſeparate ourſelves from the deteſtable opinion of the Jews. It is abſurd that they ſhould boaſt that without the help of their religion we cannot rightly obſerve this feſtival. How can they believe any thing rightly, who, having ſlain our Lord, are fallen into a kind of phrenzy, are not guided by reaſon, but hurried by violent paſſion wherever their natural madneſs drives them; hence it is that on this ſubject they cannot conceive the truth. They have ſtrayed ſo far, that inſtead of correcting former errors, they now celebrate the feaſt of Eaſter twice a year. What reaſon is there to induce us to imitate men whom we ſee engaged in ſuch groſs and manifeſt errors? We cannot permit that the ſame feaſt may be ſolemnized twice in the year. Though I ſhould not propoſe theſe things to you, yet it is incumbent on your wiſdom diligently to pray to God that he will not ſuffer your devout and well meaning

meaning minds to be defiled by the corrupt manners of such malicious men.

Moreover you may easily perceive how great an enormity it is that any dissention should subsist amongst us in so great and solemn a festival of our religion, *for our Saviour has given us one festival day* of our liberty, that is, the day of his most holy passion, and his will is that there be but *one Catholic Church*, the members of which, though dispersed in divers places, are united in one spirit, that is, in the will and pleasure of God. Let your wisdom therefore diligently consider how lamentable and shameful a thing it is, that on the same day some should give themselves *to fasting*, and others to feasting, and again when the Easter is over, some should indulge themselves with amusements, whilst others afflict themselves with *fasting and abstinence*. This matter required correction, and the same order observed in all places, for such is the good will of Divine Providence, as is well known to you all, and as it was our business to settle this question, so that we have nothing to do with the custom of the Jews, who were accessary to the death of their Lord and Master, and also to continue that laudable and decent custom, which all the churches in the world observe, whether in the West, or the South, or the North, and several also in the East observe it, and thus it has been decreed with the unanimous consent of us all. I have also engaged for you that you will easily consent to, and joyfully approve whatever is uniformly practised in the city of *Rome*, in *Italy*, in *all Africa*, in *Egypt*, in *Spain*, in *France* and *Britanny*, in *Lybia* and in all *Greece*, in the jurisdiction of *Asia* and *Pontus*, and in *Cilicia*; that you will carefully consider that in all these places there are a greater number of churches, and that their manner, ratified by common consent, is most agreeable to reason, and more remote from the false opinions of the perjured Jews.

To conclude, it was unamimously agreed that the most holy feast of *Easter* should be always celebrated on the same

day;

day; for in so holy and solemn a thing, there ought to be no disunion: to follow this opinion, in which there is no error of faith, nor stain of sin, is highly commendable. The question thus stated, it is your duty to reverence and embrace this decree with willing minds, as *a special Gift of God, a Commandment sent down from Heaven, for whatever is decreed in the Holy Council of Bishops is to be attributed to the will of God himself*, wherefore, after you have informed our beloved brethren of such things as are decreed in this Council, of the doctrine here established, and the manner of observing the holy feast of Easter; you ought first approve it yourselves, and then take order that things may be settled in that good state, which I have long desired, that you and I may celebrate that *sacred festival* on the same day; and that I may rejoice for your sake, as I certainly will when I hear that, by your pious endeavours and the grace of God, the tyranny of the Devil is utterly suppressed; and our faith, (unity and peace established,) doth flourish and encrease in the world. God keep you, my dear brethren, in prosperous health."

This letter is replete with popish errors: it says, expressly, that controversies on religious subjects are decided by the authority of Councils composed exclusively of bishops; that their decision is final and infallible under the direction of God himself; that the feast of Easter, that *nonsensical rite*, was solemnized by all christians from the very first establishment of christianity; that it was preceded by fasting and abstinence, *an intolerable rite*. The castigator, in his own opinion, better informed than the emperor, and all the prelates of his empire, tells us, that the celebration of Easter on any particular day, had no foundation either in scripture or apostolical tradition—p. 72; he therefore admits, contrary to his principles, that apostolical tradition would have sufficiently authorized this *nonsensical rite*. Why not other rites also? Some men, who have the simplicity of judging by the rules of common sense, without

the

the assistance of Socrates' Demon, or the Castigator's familiar spirit, think that the celebration of Easter has some foundation in scripture. It is presumed that every reader knows this great festival of Easter to be solemnized in commemoration of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, which is known from the scriptures to have happened on the first day of the week, which we call Sunday. St. John, says, xix, 31: "the Jews, therefore, left the bodies should remain on the cross on the Sabbath (Saturday) as it was the day of preparation (" *epei paraskeuē en,*") and that was the great day of the sabbath, asked Pilate that their legs might be broken, and they taken off," Christ therefore suffered on Friday, the eve of Saturday, and St. Paul, 1st Cor. xv, 3, 4, says: "that he rose from the dead on the third day," which is of all necessity Sunday. The four evangelists say that the women came to the sepulchre very early on the first day of the week. He was then risen, the precise time is not marked, nor is it known. To celebrate the festival of Easter on Sunday has, therefore, some foundation in scripture.

The Jews, as ordered, xii. of Exodus, sacrificed the Paschal Lamb on the evening of the 14th day of the lunar month Abib, or Nisan, as it was called, after the captivity; on that day the Saviour having strictly complied with the Jewish ordinance, instituted the venerable sacrifice of the new law, of which all the sacrifices of the old law, then abolished, were figurative, and the day following was himself offered in sacrifice on the cross. We learn from the Council of Cæsarea assembled in the year 196 of our Æra, at which presided Theophilus, bishop of that city, and Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem, that the 15th of the month Nisan fell that year on Friday the 23d of March, Christ, therefore, rose from the dead on Monday the 25th of the same month. Does the castigator think the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, facts of sufficient importance to engage the attention of his immediate disciples? Does he imagine that in little more than a century these facts were effaced from

the

the memory of the people of Paleſtine, that even the church of Jeruſalem had ſo ſoon forgotten them? If he believes it, the man who believes him, muſt be credulous indeed. At the diſtance of three centuries we yet remember that the reforming patriarch Luther was born on the 10th of November, 1483; that after two years previous inſtructions, he made the charming Miſs Boree his aſſiſtant in the reforming trade, on the 11th of June, 1525; that he ceaſed from his apoſtolical labours and matrimonial cares on the 18th of February, 1546. His prayer penned by himſelf, in one of his pious fits, is yet extant in the original manuſcript, it is the quinteſſence of his new modelled goſpel. For the edification of his admiring diſciples, the writer inſerts it: "My God through your goodneſs provide us with clothes, with hats, with riding coats and cloaks, with good fat calves with kids, with beef and mutton, with many wives and few children, to drink well and eat well is the trueway to paſs through life without irkſomeneſs." Reverend Chriſtian Junker, a zealous Lutheran member of the Royal Society of Berlin, and rector of Altenbourg, in his life of Luther, p. 225, admits this prayer to have been penned by that Reformer? Does this caſtigator think theſe facts of greater conſequence to his reformed brethren than the birth, death and reſurrection, of Jeſus Chriſt to his diſciples? If not, the prelates aſſembled at Cæſarea, in Paleſtine, might have known the day of the month on which the Saviour ſuffered without conſulting an aſtronomer; to deny it is ſtretching reformed modeſty.

It appears from their Synodical Letter that theſe prelates thought it an error to celebrate the Eaſter on the fourteenth day of the moon, as ſome Aſiatics did at that time. After declaring that the feſtival ought to be ſolemnized on Sunday, they ſay: "copies of this letter are ſent to all churches, leſt the fault of thoſe, who raſhly engage in error, be imputed to us. We wiſh you alſo to know that the church of Alexandria celebrates the feſtival the ſame day with us."

A Council, assembled at Pontus, at which presided Palmas, bishop of Amastris, one in Gaul, at which St. Ireneus presided; another composed of the prelates of Orsonea and the adjacent countries, at which Bachylus, bishop of Corinth presided, all unanimously decided, on apostolical tradition, that the Easter ought to be celebrated on Sunday—See Eus. B. 5, Cap. 23. In a word, all the churches in the Christian world, if you except these of Asia minor, and some few others, solemnized the festival on the same day, and continued the fast of the Lent until Sunday. These *nonsensical rites* were universally observed by the immediate disciples and successors of the apostles. Will the castigator permit us Christians to believe that these men, who had eyes and ears as we have, knew the rites established and practised by the apostles themselves? Or will he allow us to think that this rite, so universally observed, and considered of so much importance in religion, had some other foundation besides *will worship*, as he calls it? Was it the pope who introduced, and imposed on the Christian world this worse than *nonsensical rite*, the fast of the Lent, more hateful to modern epicures than the pope himself? If so, the papal authority was universally obeyed; to admit this proposition is ruinous to all anti-papal systems of religion, to deny it is not less ruinous to modern reformation. For if the fast of the Lent and the solemnity of Easter have not been instituted by Popes or Councils, as they most certainly were not, since they were universally observed, they must have been instituted by the apostles themselves, according to St. Austin's rule "all rites which are universally observed in the church, and are not found instituted in any Council of the church, must descend from apostolical tradition, Epis. 118. *ad Januarium.* St. Austin thought that no other authority would be universally obeyed. The castigator, better informed than Austin, does not find the obligation of fasting the Lent, or celebrating the Easter, expressly enjoined in the scriptures, and wisely concludes that no such observance was

inſtituted by the apoſtles. He has given ſo many ſpecimens of the neweſt modelled modeſty, that the writer is not ſurpriſed to hear an ignorant ſcribbler, at the diſtance of ſixteen or ſeventeen centuries, pretend to know the doctrine taught by the apoſtles, and the rites and ceremonies authoriſed by their example, better than the prelates who immediately ſucceeded them in the care of the churches which they founded and governed. Of the twelve apoſtles ſent to inſtruct the world ſeven never wrote a line, that we know. Does the caſtigator pretend that theſe men taught nothing? Or that the churches founded by them did not know the rites and ceremonies, which they themſelves obſerved? Their example, without any written precept, was more than ſufficient to eſtabliſh them.

He quotes from Socrates, as if from an authentic hiſtorian a long paſſage, in which that writer ſays: that the feaſt of Eaſter and other feſtivals were not impoſed by the goſpel or inſtituted by the apoſtles. Aerius' authority is of equal force on the ſubject: Socrates, a layman, ignorant of eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, had adopted the errors of that reforming monk of the fourth century, who, in oppoſition to his biſhop, Euſtathius, of Conſtantinople, condemned all the ceremonies of the church, particularly the celebration of feſtivals, becauſe, in theſe great ſolemnities, the biſhop, whom he hated, appeared in a conſpicuous manner at the head of the clergy and the people--See Epiphanius, Her. 76. It is not ſurpriſing that Socrates, who adopted the error, ſhould attempt to juſtify it. Religious reſtraints were not more pleaſing to that epicurean courtier than they are to his admirers of the preſent day. However, we learn from him that the feſtival of Eaſter was univerſally obſerved, and preceded by the faſt of the Lent.

That the churches in Aſia minor did celebrate the feſtival on the fourteenth day of the lunar month Niſan, as Socrates ſays, is true, and though a deviation from general diſcipline, it was tolerated by Victor's predeceſſors;

predeceſſors; but when Blaſtus inſidiouſly endeavoured to introduce Judaiſm, founding a pretence on the coincidence of the Chriſtian feſtival in Aſia, with the Jewiſh paſſover, Victor thought it neceſſary to correct that variety, and eſtabliſh uniformity in that diſtrict, with the other churches, in which the feſtival was obſerved on the Sunday; with that view, he directed Polycrates, biſhop of Epheſus, to aſſemble the biſhops of the diſtrict; the prelates knowing that the cuſtom of celebrating the feſtival on the 14th day, as obſerved in their churches, had been tolerated by Victor's predeceſſors, perſiſted in it. Victor finding perſuaſions ineffectual, threatened to iſſue an excommunication, Euſ. L. 5, C. 24.

Euſebius, on whoſe authority Socrates ſeems to have reſted his opinion, ſays that Victor did actually excommunicate the Aſiatics. This ſeverity did not meet the approbation of other prelates, who, though they themſelves celebrated the Eaſter on the ſame day with the Roman Church, did not think the diverſity in the Aſiatic manner, a ſufficient reaſon to juſtify ſo harſh a ſentence. St. Ireneus complained of it in his letter to Victor: "the prieſts," ſaid he, "before Soter, who governed the church in which you this day preſide, that is, Anicetus, Pius, Hygins, Teleſphorus, and Sixtus did not obſerve the feſtival in that manner (that is on the 14th day of the lunar month Niſan) nor did they permit thoſe, who were with them to obſerve it in that manner; but they remained in peace with thoſe who did ..... no one was ever expelled the church for that cuſtom." In the ſame letter he ſays, that though the pontiff Anicetus could not prevail on Polycarp to change that cuſtom, he did not threaten to cenſure him; he alſo obſerves: that there was as great a diverſity in obſerving the faſt in the holy week, as there was in the celebration of the feſtival, ſome faſting three whole days without any nouriſhment, others two days, ſome forty hours, and others but one day; "this diverſity," ſays he, "has not commenced in our time, but a long time ago, under our predeceſſors, who do not ſeem to have taken

taken ſufficient precautions." This diverſity in the manner of obſerving the faſt of the Lent, as well as in the celebration of the Eaſter, whilſt both were invariably held ſacred by all churches in the Chriſtian world, ſhew them to have been of apoſtolical inſtitution, but that ſome churches were not exact in obſerving the inſtitution in all its circumſtances. Socrates, ſpeaking of this diverſity, ſays that the Greeks faſted ſix weeks before Eaſter, and the Romans but three, which is a miſtake, for we know from Leo the Great, who was biſhop of Rome in Socrates' time, that the Romans faſted the whole Lent, which from its very name implies forty days, "*quadrageſima.*" Socrates ſays that the Romans did not faſt on Saturdays in Lent, a miſtake which ſhews that he knew nothing of the diſcipline of that church but by vague report; for the Romans faſted all Saturdays; and were cenſured by the Council of Trull, Can. 55, for faſting on Saturdays in the Lent. Gregory, therefore, was juſtified in ſaying of that hiſtorian *multum mentitur*. This is one of the caſtigator's admired Fathers.

Though many prelates in Victor's time, unacquainted perhaps with his motives, did not approve his conduct with regard to the Aſiatics, the event ſhewed that Victor was better informed, and his apparent ſeverity juſtifiable; for as Chriſt neither died, nor roſe from the dead on the fourteenth day of Niſan, a commemoration either of his death or reſurrection, could not with ſtrict propriety be ſolemnized on that day. Hence the feſtival of the Eaſter, as celebrated by the Aſiatics, had a ſtrong appearance of the Jewiſh Paſſover, from which *Blaſtus*, and his adherents, pretended to conclude, that this being the principal ceremony of the old law, the other ceremonies of that law ought to be obſerved alſo. To remove the occaſion, and efface every ſhadow of diſcordance, the celebrated Council of Nice, exerciſing that power, which, in the ſimplicity of ancient times, was thought to have been veſted by Jeſus Chriſt in the paſtors of his church aſſembled in his name, ordered all

Chriſtians

Chriſtians to celebrate the feſtival of Eaſter on the Sunday immediately ſucceeding the fourteenth day of the lunar month Niſan; that month, the fourteenth day of which fell on the vernal equinox, or immediately after it, was called Niſan by the Jews, and was the firſt month of their year; diſobedience to this order of the Council was conſidered as ſomething worſe than error, and the Quartodecimans were in conſequence numbered amongſt ſectaries. What would theſe venerable paſtors have thought of an obſcure individual, in a remote corner of the world, who ſome 1400 hundred years after their death, pretends to know the origin of the diſcipline obſerved in the churches, which they, and their predeceſſors in office, ſince the apoſtles days, had governed, better than they did themſelves, and ſcoffingly calls their moſt ſolemn ceremonies *nonſenſical rites*? The writer pities the ſimplicity, and laments the infatuation of ſo many inconſiderate victims, who liſten to the tales of aſſuming arrogance, as the Heathens did to their oracles, and place the ſame confidence in them.

From the decree of the Council of Nice we learn that the prelates there aſſembled thought themſelves veſted with a power of ordering a feſtival to be ſolemnized on a certain day; the obſervance of the feſtival for ſo many ages on the day determined by the Council, ſhews that all Chriſtian churches believed it. The caſtigator ſays they were all miſtaken; he very modeſtly ſets his private opinion in oppoſition to the united authority of the Chriſtian world. This, to a diſpaſſionate enquirer, has all the appearance of downright impoſture or manifeſt illuſion, whether impoſture or illuſion, it argues the folly of appealing to the authority of the Fathers, in ſupport of a doctrine, as oppoſite to that which is believed and taught by them, as the moſt glaring falſehood is to an intuitive truth.

The caſtigator tells us, p. 76, that popes have been more than once excommunicated for condemning the doctrines of the goſpel. He has not ſpecified the doc-

trines

trines which they condemned, nor cited any authority to support the assertion. It is true in a marginal note he instances two popes, *Liberius* and *Vigilius*, of whose history he seems to know nothing: neither the one nor the other was excommunicated for condemning the doctrines of the gospel, nor were they excommunicated at all. Though there were many impudent monks at that time, there was not one so lost to shame as to presume to denounce a sentence against the chief pastors of the church: this was reserved for the self-created evangelist of Wirtemberg, who, to the no small astonishment of the world, excommunicated Leo X. Liberius and Vigilius were blamed and justly, the former, not for teaching the Arian heresy, for he condemned it; but for condemning Athanasius, whom he knew to be unjustly accused, and persecuted for his defence of truth; and for communicating with Ursatius and Valens, whom he ought to have known, and in all appearance did know, to be Arians in principle, though they subscribed a Catholic formula at Sirmium, where they made their peace with Liberius. However as the term *Omoousious Consubstantial* was suppressed in that formula, it was wrested by the Arians to support their heresy, and Liberius justly blamed for subscribing it.

Vigilius was not less deservedly blamed for promising the Empress Theodora to reinstate her favourite Anthymus, the Eutychian patriarch of Constantinople, who had been deposed by pope Agapitus, if she would procure him the pontificate; and for writing to Anthymus, Theodosius, of Alexandria, and Severus, of Antioch, that he was of their opinion and communion, when the General Belisarius, by order of the Empress, had banished the true Pope Sylverius, and substituted Vigilius by his own authority, but Vigilius was not then pope: the rightful pope Sylverius was yet living in a state of exile and persecution: when, on the demise of Sylverius, by the consent and appropation of the Roman clergy and people, Vigilius became the righful possessor of the then vacant

vacant See, the empreſs inſiſting on his promiſe of reinſtating her favourite Anthymus, he replied that he had raſhly promiſed, and ſinned grievouſly in ſo doing, that he would not add one crime to another by fulfilling an unjuſt and unlawful engagement, refuſed poſitively to reinſtate Anthymus, approved the 5th general Council which condemned the Eutychian hereſy; was himſelf ſent into exile, and perſecuted with great ſeverity—See Paul the deacon, in his life of Juſtinian.

The promiſe of Chriſt to Peter ſaying, "I have prayed for thee that thy faith ſhould not fail," is manifeſtly verified in the hiſtory of this pontiff: before he obtained the pontificate we ſee in him a court politician, an artful intriguer, an unprincipled ſchemer, ſolely intent on the gratification of his ambition, regardleſs of the means. The inſtant he became the rightful ſucceſſor of the apoſtle we find him totally changed; religiouſly attentive to the duties of his ſtate; unſhaken as a rock: neither threats nor promiſes, perſecutions, nor death could induce him to deviate from truth or give countenance to error. During a ſpace of eighteen years he governed the church in turbulent times, and ſteered the fiſherman's boat with a ſteady hand. The hiſtory of this pontiff, which the caſtigator will hardly venture to diſpute, as it is given by cotemporary writers, furniſhes the moſt unqueſtionable proofs of the authority, which the Roman pontiffs exerciſed, and were thought to poſſeſs over all the Greek and Aſiatic churches. For the information of thoſe readers, who have no familiar ſpirit to conſult, the writer gives a ſhort ſketch of it:

The Emperor Juſtinian having taken Africa from the Vandals, in the year 536, made vaſt preparations to recover Italy from the Goths, which they had poſſeſſed ſince the year 476, when Odoacer took it from Romulus Auguſtulus, then emperor of the Weſt, and declared himſelf king of Italy. Theodatus, the then Gothic king, terrified by the threats and preparations of the emperor, wrote to Agapitus, the Roman pontiff, and the ſena-

tors

tors, that if they did not avert the impending ſtorm from Italy, he would put the ſenators, their wives and children to death. The ſenators alarmed, ſent the pope to Conſtantinople to intercede with the emperor, and endeavour to prevail on him to deſiſt. His remonſtrances were ineffectual: the emperor was reſolved to indemnify himſelf for the heavy expenſes incurred in the expedition; he left the ſenators, their wives and children to their fate. Theodatus' intended vengeance was prevented by his death. His ſoldiers, ſeeing the progreſs of the imperial General *Belliſarius* in Italy, revolted, and declared *Vitiges* their king. This traitor ſacrificed the tyrant to the hatred of the Romans, and ſaved the ſenators from impending death, *Proc. de Bel. Goth.*

The pope on his arrival at Conſtantinople found Epiphanius, the Catholic patriarch of Conſtantinople dead, and Anthymus, an Eutychian, biſhop of Trebiſonde, tranſlated to the patriarchal See, through the credit and influence of the empreſs Theodora. Notwithſtanding the entreaties of the emperor, the ſolicitations and ſecret threats of the empreſs, Agapitus depoſed him, and, in the church of Saint Mary, conſecrated Mennas, with the approbation of the emperor and the people, to fill that vacant See, *Lib. C.* 21°. Agapitus died ſoon after in Conſtantinople, and Sylverius was choſen in Rome to ſucceed him. The empreſs Theodora, deſirous of reinſtating her favourite Anthymus, ſignified to *Vigilius*, deacon of the Roman church, then in Conſtantinople, that ſhe would enſure his election for the Roman See, on his promiſe of ſuppreſſing the Council of Chalcedon, and approving the faith of Anthymus, of Theodorus, of Alexandria, and Severus, of Antioch, that is, the Eutychian hereſy. This promiſe *Vigilius* made, received from the empreſs ſeven hundred pounds of gold, with an order to the Roman general Belliſarius, to put him in poſſeſſion of the See; on his arrival at Rome he found Sylverius acknowledged, went to Ravenna, ſhewed the General the empreſs's order, and promiſed him two hundred

pounds

pounds of gold if he would diſpoſe of Sylverius. Belliſarius took Rome from the Goths, on the 10th of December, 536, and under pretence that Sylverius had given ſome intelligence to the Goths, ſent him an exile to Pataras in Lycia, and placed *Vigilius* in the pontifical chair, *Lib in Br. Ca.* 22°.

From this ſhort ſketch it appears, that the pope's authority was as unlimited over the patriarch of Conſtantinople after the Council of Chalcedon as before it; the ſequel of Vigilius's hiſtory ſhews it not leſs forcibly: when, after the taking and ſacking of Rome by *Totila*, on the 17th of December, 546, Vigilius was called to Conſtantinople by the emperor, though a priſoner, and treated with great cruelty, he publiſhed a ſentence of condemnation againſt the empreſs Theodora, and the *acephali*, or *independents* of the day; by his unſhaken firmneſs in ſupport of the Council of Chalcedon he diſappointed the views, and rendered ineffectual all the efforts of Theodorus of Cappadocia; and of the other partiſans of the Eutychian hereſy, who, though all-powerful at Court, and the pope in the church of Saint Euphemia of Chalcedon, as a place of refuge, could not otherwiſe make their peace with him, than by offering to him a profeſſion of faith, in which they declare, that to preſerve eccleſiaſtical unity they receive the four general Councils of Nice, of Conſtantinople, of Epheſus, and of Chalcedon, promiſing to obſerve inviolably, all that was in them decided with the conſent of the legates and vicars of the Holy See, by whom the popes have preſided over theſe Councils, *each in his time*; a profeſſion of the ſame form was given by *Mennas* patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, by *Theodore* of *Cæſarea*, by *Andrew* of *Epheſus*, by *Theodorus* of *Antioch*, in *Piſidia*, *Peter* of *Tarus*, and many others—See Fleury, B. xxxiii. p. 431.

It cannot be ſaid or thought that a man, who, in defence of his life had taken refuge in the ſanctuary, uſed any undue influence to engage theſe prelates to make ſuch a public and authentic acknowledgment of the ſu-

 periority

periority of his See. The fear of giving offence to the clergy of their ſeveral dioceſes, and to the faithful in general, to whom the fact was as well known then, as it is to us now, and who would no more acknowledge a biſhop diſclaiming the authority of the Roman See then, than we would now, is the only motive which can juſtify their ſubmiſſion.

If the caſtigator had conſulted eccleſiaſtical hiſtory he would have found one pope, who, though not excommunicated whilſt living, was ſeverely cenſured after his death, on the ſuppoſition of his having countenanced the Eutychian hereſy at leaſt by ſilence; whether the cenſure was well or ill founded, a queſtion of difficult diſcuſſion, it is certain that the 8th general Council, in which he was cenſured, did not think a pope infallible, the Catholics of the United Kingdom, with great propriety, therefore, declare that the pope's infallibility is no article of catholic doctrine, nor term of communion.

To fill his pamphlet with ſomething the caſtigator gives us the hiſtory of *Afriarius*, an African, who, excommunicated by his own biſhop *Urbanus*, had appealed to pope Zozimus. This affords him an opportunity of diſcharging a certain portion of his bile in the abuſe, which he laviſhes on that venerable pontiff and his ſucceſſor Cœleſtine. Their arrogance and impoſture he muſt have learned from his ſpirit of divination: hiſtorians are ſilent on the ſubject. He concludes a long tale, ſome parts of which are founded on fact, others of his own invention, by ſaying, that this prieſt of Sicca, in Africa, who had been abſolved on appeal by the pope, acknowledged, in preſence of an African Council, the crimes with which he was charged. The reader will be ſurpriſed to hear a man cite againſt the pope's authority a fact, which from his own ſtatement tends to eſtabliſh it: for he ſays, p. 84, "by the protection of the biſhop of Rome he might have eſcaped had he been able to withſtand the ſtings of his own conſcience, but upon the fourth day, to the great confuſion of the legate and the

ſupremacy

ſupremacy, he confeſſed every crime." From this ſtatement it is manifeſt that the pope's authority was acknowledged by theſe African prelates, otherwiſe his authority would not have ſaved the man, whom they had before condemned. How the crimes of that African prieſt could turn to the confuſion of the Roman pontiff or his legate is not eaſily conceived. A Judge in appeal muſt pronounce on the proceedings already had in the Court from which the appeal comes. If the man had been legally convicted no protection could have ſaved him. A man, who conſults common ſenſe, would ſay that this African was a hypocrite, who had impoſed on the pope; whoſe crimes, though known to the African prelates on public report, had not been juridically proved; it was therefore neither arrogance nor impoſture in the pope to abſolve him: it was his official duty, and this caſtigator, whilſt he vents his ſpleen on theſe popes, expoſes his own ignorance to contempt. To detect the crimes of perſons not known is a privilege to which popes pretend no title, this, with all ſuch, they reſign to Bower, Francowitz, and other retailers of ſlanders, who, in the malignity of their own hearts, at the diſtance of ſome centuries, diſcover the motives which they lend to innocence and integrity; in order to give theſe virtues the colour of their oppoſite vices.

It is true the African prelates did at that time prohibit appeals in perſonal cauſes to Rome, and in their Synodical Letter to the Pope aſſigned a ſufficient and ſatisfactory reaſon for ſo doing: "how," ſaid they, "can a judgment beyond the ſeas be certain, ſince the neceſſary witneſſes cannot be ſent, either on account of the weakneſs of their ſex, or their advanced age, or ſome other impediment." Long before that time St. Cyprian complained of the irregularity of ſuch appeals; and ſince that time, France, Spain, Germany and England, before the Reformation, loudly and juſtly complained of them. What then? This only proves that ſuch appeals were always made, and often abuſively, to the great detri-

ment

ment of eccleſiaſtical diſcipline; that power is frequently abuſed no man doubts, but the abuſe of power ſhews that power to be real: for if fictitious, it could not be abuſed.

There are ſome men, who having borrowed an opinion, however falſe or abſurd, ſeize with avidity every ſhadow, which ſeems to countenance the deception; there are others, who artfully wreſt, in ſupport of the opinions, which it is their intereſt to lend, the very reaſons, which detect the fallacy. It is not eaſy to determine to which of theſe claſſes our caſtigator belongs: the facts which he has ſelected in ſupport of error, uniformly, and unequivocally, condemn it. He is not leſs unlucky in his choice of witneſſes. A Jerom, a monk remarkably auſtere, a mirror of penance, as inimical to epicuriſm, the idol of modern reformiſts, as the Baptiſt himſelf; in whoſe works all the errors borrowed from Jovinien, Vigilantius, &c. now taught in the reformed churches, are refuted with inexpreſſible force and perſpicuity, a man who informs us that he was himſelf ſecretary to the Roman pontiff Damaſus, and aſſiſted him in anſwering the Synodical conſultations of the Eaſt and the Weſt, that is, of the then Chriſtian world: in his letter to *Gerontia*, adviſing that lady to continue unmarried, he relates an anecdote which he heard at Rome, "many years ago," ſays he," "when I aſſiſted Damaſus, biſhop of the Roman city, in eccleſiaſtical writings, and anſwered the Synodical conſultations of the Eaſt and the Weſt." It was, therefore, the cuſtom of the Eaſt and the Weſt to conſult the Roman See on difficult queſtions; hence we find Jerom himſelf, confeſſedly the moſt learned man of his time, conſulting the ſame pontiff, and reſting the expreſſion of his faith, in a difficult queſtion, on the authority of the Holy See. The Greek term "*hypoſtaſis*" is of doubtful ſignification; it may expreſs a *ſubſiſting perſon*, or a *ſubſtance*, in the former ſenſe it was commonly uſed by Catholic writers, in the latter by Heathen philoſophers. The Arians, and other ſectaries in the Eaſt,

wreſted

wreſted this ambiguous expreſſion from the ſenſe intended by Catholic writers, to that ſenſe which ſeemed to give countenance to their errors. St. Jerom, preſſed by contending parties to declare his faith, dared not uſe the expreſſion to ſignify either *perſon* or *ſubſtance* without the pope's approbation. He wrote two letters to Damaſus on the ſubject; in the firſt he ſays, that in the diſtracted ſtate of the church in Aſia he found it neceſſary to conſult the See of Peter: "though," ſays he, "your greatneſs terrifies, your humanity invites, as a ſheep I deſire the victim of ſalvation from the prieſt, and claim protection from the ſhepherd. Let envy recede, and the oſtentation of the Roman dignity ceaſe. I ſpeak to the ſucceſſor of the fiſherman, to a diſciple of the croſs, following no chief but Chriſt, I am united in communion with your beatitude, that is, with the chair of St. Peter, on that rock I know the church to be built, whoſoever eats the lamb without this houſe is a profaner." There were three biſhops then contending for the patriarchal See of Antioch, of which church Jerom was himſelf a clergyman: of theſe, in his letter to Damaſus, he ſays: "I do not know, *Vitalus*, *Meletius*, I reject, nor do I know *Paulinus*, whoſoever does not collect with you ſcatters, ... if we aſk what they think may be underſtood by three *hypoſtaſes*; they ſay three ſubſiſting perſons; we anſwer: thus we believe, the ſenſe does not ſatisfy them: they exact the word becauſe I know not what poiſon is concealed in the ſyllables: we exclaim if any one does not confeſs three *hypoſtaſes* or three *enypoſtata*, that is, three ſubſiſting perſons, let him be an *anatheme* . . . . but if any man, by *hypoſtaſen*, underſtanding *ouſian eſſence*, or *ſubſtance*, does not ſay that in three perſons there is one *hypoſtaſen*, he is alienated from Chriſt, and in this confeſſion, alſo with you we are impreſſed with the ſtamp of union. Decide if you pleaſe, I beſeech you. I will not fear to ſay three *hypoſtaſes* if you command." He warns the pope at the ſame time againſt the artifices of theſe ſectaries who urged him to uſe a

term

term which they might wreſt in ſupport of their errors, and then concludes, " wherefore, I conjure you by the *Crucified*, by the *Salvation* of the world, by the *Conſubſtantial Trinity*, that by your letters I be authoriſed to ſay three *hypoſtaſes*, or not to ſay it, and, leſt the obſcurity of the place in which I dwell ſhould deceive you, deign to tranſmit the writings by the carriers of letters to Evagrius the prieſt, whom you well know, and ſignify to me at the ſame time with whom at Antioch I ought to communicate, becauſe the Campenſes, united with the ſectaries of Tharſis, deſire nothing elſe but that they may, ſupported by the authority of your communion, preach three *hypoſtaſes*, with the old ſenſe."

As this letter remained unanſwered, St. Jerom wrote a ſecond in a preſſing ſtyle, in which, after expoſing his embarraſſment, he ſays: " in the mean time I exclaim if any one be united to the chair of Peter he is mine. *Meletius*, *Vitalus*, and *Paulinus*, (the contending biſhops) ſay they are united to you. If one only ſaid it I could believe it; but now two aſſert a falſehood, if not all three, wherefore, I conjure your beatitude, by the croſs of our Lord, to ſignify to me by letter, with whom in Syria I may communicate."

From theſe letters we learn, that to wreſt words from the intended ſenſe of the writer, in order to countenance new opinions, is not of modern invention. We ſee the embarraſſment, into which the artifices of ſectaries, wreſting his words, and garbling his works, threw this moſt accurate and intelligent writer, whilſt yet living; we are the leſs ſurpriſed that many centuries after his death, other ſectaries, equally artful, ſhould attempt to make him, and other writers not more cautious, ſpeak a language, which they never intended. The writer makes no illuſion to the caſtigator, he does not ſuſpect him to have read a line of Jerom's works—the few garbled paſſages which he gives are tranſcribed from *Illyricus*

We alſo learn from Jerom's letters that in Aſia, not only

only catholics acknowledged the authority of the Roman See; but that even different ſectaries, in order to impoſe on the credulity of the Public, founded their pretenſions on a ſuppoſed communion with that See. So univerſally and ſo publicly was it known, and ſo deeply was it impreſſed in the minds of all Chriſtians, that the See of Peter is the centre of union, the bond of Catholic communion.

To enable readers not verſed in the works of theſe early writers, whom by reaſon of high antiquity and great authority we call Fathers of the Church, to judge of the folly of this caſtigator, who refers to Jerom for a condemnation of popery, the writer tranſcribes a few paſſages from that Father ſo juſtly celebrated, not only for his profound knowledge of the ſcriptures, but alſo for his extenſive acquaintance with every branch of polite literature; of whom Eraſmus, an acknowledged judge, ſays, that his works are an opulent treaſure, diverſified with the beautiful and the ſublime of all languages and ſciences.

In his firſt book againſt Jovinien, Jerom ſtates the errors of that reformiſt:

1ſt. That a ſtate of perpetual celibacy is not more meritorious than the matrimonial ſtate.

2d. That they, who are regenerated by baptiſm, cannot fall, or, as he terms it, be ſubverted by the Devil.

3d. That abſtinence from meats is uſeleſs.

The 4th, and laſt, that all who keep their baptiſm will obtain one and the ſame reward in the Kingdom of Heaven.

Theſe, ſays Jerom, are the hiſſings of the old ſerpent, "*hæc ſunt ſibila ſerpentis antiqui*," By theſe counſels the dragon expelled man from paradiſe, "*draco his ce conſiliis de Paradiſo hominem expulit.*" Thus Jerom qualifies the doctrines which the caſtigator muſt teach. He then, by a train of irreſiſtible reaſoning, ſhews not ſimply the falſehood, but the impiety of theſe doctrines, refutes the ſilly reaſons offered by Jovinien in juſtification of theſe errors,

errors, and which modern reformists continue to repeat, *ad nauseum usque.*

Jovinien, to justify his first error, had cited the example of the patriarchs in the old law, and descending to the new law, insisted on the prerogative of Supreme Head of the Church, conferred on Peter, a married man, in preference to John, in a state of celibacy. To this Jerom replied, that though celibacy was not so seriously recommended in the old law, it was yet practised by their greatest prophets, Elias, Elisha, Daniel, Jeremias, &c. To the prerogative conferred on Peter, he replied that it was conferred on age. The writer transcribes the whole passage in the original—" Si autem obnixè contenderit Joannem Virginem non fuisse & nos Amoris præcipui Causam Virginitatem diximus, exponat ille: si Virgo non fuit, cur præ Cæteris Apostolis plus amatus sit? Et dicis super Petrum fundatur Ecclesia, licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat, et cuncti Claves regni cælorum accipiant, & ex æquo super eos Ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur, tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut Capite Constituto Schismatis tollatur occasio. Sed cur non Joannes electus est Virgo? Ætati delatum est quia Petrus senior erat: ne adhuc adolescens, ac penè puer progressæ ætatis hominibus præferretur."

" But if he earnestly contend that John was not a virgin, and we have said that virginity was the cause of singular love, let him explain, if he was not a virgin, why he was more beloved by Jesus Christ, than the other apostles? But you say the church was founded on Peter, though the same thing in another place be done on all the apostles, and all receive the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the strength of the Church be equally solidated on them; yet for this amongst the twelve, one is chosen, that a head being constituted the occasion of schism should be taken away. But why was not John, a virgin, chosen? A preference was given to age because Peter was older, and that a youth, as yet almost a boy,

boy, ſhould not be preferred to men of advanced age."

From this paſſage the caſtigator has ſelected theſe words, p. 31, "the church is founded on all the apoſtles; and all have received the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the firmneſs of the church reſts on them equally," and this he thinks concluſive evidence that Jerom did not think Peter ſuperior to any of the apoſtles. The writer does not remember to have ſeen ſuch unbluſhing impoſture; even doating ſtupidity cannot juſtify it. It is a lamentable truth that many well diſpoſed but uninformed chriſtians are duped by ſuch impoſtures.

In his writings againſt Vigilantius, Jerom is not leſs unfriendly to modern reformiſts, in whoſe defence it muſt be admitted, that not one of their errors is of late invention; they have been all ſeverally taught at different times, and in different places, but were never united into one pretended rule of faith, until Luther, of reforming memory, compoſed his monſtrous code.

Jerom begins the work by enumerating many monſters of which we read in ſacred and prophane hiſtory; amongſt theſe he ranks Vigilantius, "who," ſays he, "actuated by the unclean ſpirit, reſiſts the ſpirit of Chriſt; ſays that the tombs of the martyrs are not to be venerated; that vigils are to be condemned; that alleluia is not to be ſung but on Eaſter day; that continence is hereſy, and chaſtity the ſource of licentiouſneſs, and as Euphorbus is ſaid to be re-born in Pythagoras, ſo the perverſe mind of Jovinien is riſen in him, hence both in the one and the other we are forced to reply to the inſidious arts of the demon. Jovinien condemned by the authority of the Roman church with the pleaſures of the table gave up the ghoſt; Vigilantius, now an inn-keeper, mixes water with wine, and by his accuſtomed art endeavours to unite the poiſon of perfidy with the Catholic faith: he condemns virginity, he hates chaſtity, at the banquets of worldlings he rails

againſt the faſts of the ſaints." A man would imagine that he was deſcribing a modern reformiſt. To the charge of idolatry, which was then made, and now, after a lapſe of many centuries, revived, he replies: "mad head! Who ever adored a martyr? Who ever thought a man a God? When Paul and Barnaby were thought by the people of Lycaonia to be Jupiter and Mercury, and victims were prepared to be offered to them, they rent their garments and ſaid they were men; not but they were better than the dead men Jupiter and Mercury, but by an Heathen ſuperſtition the honor due to God was offered to them." Thus Jerom diſtinguiſhes the honor due to God from the reſpect and reverence which is due to ſome of his creatures. It grieves him, continues Jerom, ſpeaking of Vigilantius that the relicks of the martyrs are covered with a precious veil..... Are we then ſacrilegious when we enter the churches of the apoſtles? Was Conſtantine (the emperor) ſacrilegious, who tranſlated the holy relicks of Andrew, Luke and Timothy, to Conſtantinople? Before theſe the demons cry, and they who dwell in Vigilantius confeſs they feel their preſence. Is the emperor Arcudius to be called ſacrilegious, who after ſo long a time tranſlated the bones of Samuel from Judea to Thrace? Are all the biſhops to be judged not only ſacrilegious but inſane, who carried *that ſilent thing crumbling aſhes*,* in ſilk and golden veſſels? Were all the people of all churches inſane, who met the holy relicks and received them as joyfully as if they had ſeen the prophet preſent and alive, ſo that from Paleſtine to Chalcedon the crouds of people were joined, and their voices reſounded in praiſe of Chriſt? Was it Samuel they adored, not Chriſt of whom Samuel was the levite, the prophet? You ſuſpect him to be dead, therefore you blaſpheme, read the goſpel: the God of Abraham, the God of Iſaac, the God of Jacob, he is not the God of the dead but of the living..... you ſay in your pamphlet that whilſt we

* Vigilantius's words.

we live we may pray one for the other; but after death the prayer of one is not to be heard for another;" to this Jerom replies: "the apoſtles and martyrs in the body, whilſt yet ſolicitous for themſelves, prayed for others, how much more fervently after the attainment of their crowns, their victories, their triumphs? One man, Moſes, obtained from God pardon for ſix hundred thouſand armed men; Stephen, the imitator of his Lord, the firſt martyr of Chriſt, ſued for pardon for his perſecutors; now they are with Chriſt will they have leſs credit? Paul the apoſtle ſays that two hundred and ſeventy ſix ſouls were given to him in the ſhip; now that he is freed and with Chriſt will he ſhut his mouth? For all, who in the world have believed in his goſpel will he not have the power to ſpeak?"

He confounds Vigilantius by the unanimous conſent and invariable uſage of all Chriſtian churches: "does the Roman biſhop ſin, who offers ſacrifice to the Lord over the bones of the dead men Peter and Paul, in our opinion venerable, in yours, but vile duſt? And he thinks their tombs the altars of Chriſt; not only the biſhop of one city, but all the biſhops of the world, do they err when deſpiſing the inn-keeper Vigilantius, they enter the churches of the dead, in which, this *vile duſt, and I know not what aſhes*, are wrapt up in linen?"

From this paſſage we learn that the relicks of the ſaints were under the altars of the churches in Jerom's days; that on theſe altars all the biſhops of the Chriſtian world offered the ſacrifice of the maſs, as they do yet in our churches.

In Jerom's defence of celibacy ſome ſevere ſtrictures on ſecond or third marriages eſcaped his pen, which were garbled, and diſtorted by the diſciples of Vigilantius, who pretended that he condemned matrimony in common with Montanus; in a letter to Marcella on the ſubject, he ſtates the difference between the doctrines of the church and the errors of Montanus even where they ſeem to agree. In this epiſtle he expreſsly ſays that

Chriſt

Chriſt founded his church on Peter: "*if the apoſtle Peter, on whom the Lord founded the church* . . . . . we diſagree (with the Montaniſts) in the rule of faith. We place the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, each in his own perſon, though we unite them in ſubſtance. They, following the doctrines of Sabellius, confine the Trinity within the limits of one perſon; we do not ſo much deſire ſecond marriages, as we allow them. They think them ſo criminal, that he, who contracts a ſecond marriage is thought an adulterer; we faſt one Lent in the whole year according to the tradition of the apoſtles at a congruous time; they make three Lents in the year as if three Saviours had ſuffered; not but it is lawful to faſt through the whole year, Pentecoſt excepted; but it is one thing to offer a gift voluntarily, another thing to do it of neceſſity; with us biſhops hold the place of the apoſtles; with them biſhops are the third order: they have patriarchs from Pepuſa, in Phrygia, in the firſt place; on the ſecond order they place canons, and thus the biſhops are thrown into the third place, almoſt the laſt; as if their religion was more brilliant becauſe what is firſt with us is laſt with them; they for almoſt every fault ſhut the doors of the church; we daily read, 'I deſire the ſinner's repentance more than his death; and ths man, who falls will he not riſe again, ſaith the Lord, and turn to me you returning ſons and I will heal your converſion.' They are rigid, not but they commit greater ſins, but there is this difference between us and them, that they are aſhamed to confeſs ſins, as if they were guiltleſs; whilſt we do penance we more eaſily obtain pardon, I omit . . . ."

From this letter we learn that in Jerom's days it was believed that Chriſt had founded his church on Peter; that biſhops were the ſucceſſors of the apoſtles; that the faſt of the Lent was of apoſtolical inſtitution; that ſins were confeſſed and penitential auſterities in uſe; in a word, we learn that the Chriſtian world was in peaceable poſſeſſion of obſerving all theſe popiſh ſuperſtitions and

and nonſenſical rites ſo hateful to the caſtigator. How ſtupidly ignorant he muſt have been to appeal to Jerom for a condemnation of popery!

We are now to diſcuſs the paſſage which he cites from Jerom's letter to Evagrius, p. 85, in it Jerom ſays that a biſhop at Rome, or Eugubium, Conſtantinople or Rhegium, are of the ſame worth and the ſame prieſthood, the advantage of wealth and the diſadvantage of poverty neither make a biſhop lower nor higher, for they are all ſucceſſors of the apoſtles. Who ever doubted it? In that letter Jerom ſeverely cenſures the preſumption of ſome arch-deacons, who, charged with the adminiſtration of the eccleſiaſtical funds, thought themſelves ſuperior to the prieſts who received their ſubſiſtence from them. He ſhews that the deacon is inferior to the prieſt becauſe the deacon is promoted to the order of prieſthood; that the prieſt is next in order to the biſhop, and not much inferior to him in dignity: "what does the biſhop," ſays he, "ordination only excepted, which the prieſt does not?" That the poſſeſſion of wealth makes no diſtinction amongſt the clergy, which is literally true, all biſhops are equally biſhops, and ſuperior to prieſts and deacons, whether in great cities or villages. The commencement of that letter, "we read in Iſaias that fools will ſpeak fooliſh things," is ſtrictly applicable to this reverend paſtor of a church, in which there is neither biſhop, prieſt nor deacon, and who confidently cites, in ſupport of ſuch extravagance, a letter in which theſe orders are diſtinctly ſpecified and ſaid to form an hierarchy ſimilar to that of the old law, that is, that biſhops, prieſts and deacons, are in the Chriſtian church what Aaron, his ſons and the levites, were in the temple.

His talent for contradiction is confeſſedly great, it is rather unfortunate that in the diſtribution of logical powers Nature has not been liberal: he fills four or five pages with citations from St. Cyprian, to which he pretends to affix a ſenſe of which Cyprian never dreamed. The writer in his remarks had cited Cyprian's letter to the

the Roman pontiff Cornelius, in which, ſpeaking of the ſchiſm cauſed by the anti-pope Novatien, Cyprian ſays: "ſects and ſchiſms reſult from this only, that obedience is not paid to the prieſt of God; nor is it conſidered that there is but one prieſt of God for the time, and one Judge for the time in the place of Chriſt, to whom, if according to Divine inſtruction, the whole fraternity obeyed, no one would diſturb the college of prieſts." If we believe the caſtigator the Roman pontiff was not that one prieſt of whom St. Cyprian ſpoke. This he wittily remarks did not occur to the writer. It did not occur to the writer that Cyprian ſpoke nonſenſe, it occurred to him, and muſt to the caſtigator, if his ſpirit of divination has not infatuated him, that Cyprian ſpoke of ſome *one prieſt* to whom all other prieſts were ſubordinate: for *the whole fraternity* can ſignify nothing elſe; and the obligation of obedience, of all neceſſity, imports ſubordination; and if the Roman pontiff, to whom Cyprian's letter is addreſſed, and whoſe See he calls the *See of Peter*, and the *principal church* from which the unity of the prieſthood ariſes, be not that one prieſt to whom all others owe obedience, who was that one prieſt, to whom even the Roman pontiff was ſubject? And to whoſe See the *See of St. Peter*, *the principal See*, was ſubordinate?

His ſpirit of divination has not enabled him to affix any ſenſe to Cyprian's words, but he ſays the meaning of them muſt be found elſewhere, that is, becauſe the words are ſo clearly expreſſive in this paſſage that they cannot be miſunderſtood, ſome ambiguous expreſſion, many of which are found in all voluminous works, muſt be adduced to divert the reader's attention. With this view he ſeizes on a paſſage in Cyprian's letter to Antonianus, which he new models, as he imagines, to the entire ſatisfaction of his readers, "the epiſcopal government ought to be but one, ſpread abroad among many biſhops and agreeing heartily together." In this paſſage he finds that Cyprian ſaid *epiſcopal government is founded*

founded in unity, and from his own words, which he obligingly lends to Cyprian, concludes that Cyprian means unity of counſel, not of ſupreme government. He has not told us what ſort of government that is which is founded in the unity of counſel without any authority veſted in the perſon at the head of it. We are indebted to the creative imagination of the caſtigator for the idea of a government without authority. Unfortunately Cyprian does not ſay that epiſcopal government is founded in unity: he ſays that *epiſcopal government*, or, rather, *epiſcopal order is one*, "epiſcopatus unus eſt," of which a part is held by each biſhop in ſolidum, a legal term which the writer cannot expreſs in Engliſh.

In Cyprian's works there is not a letter, in which the Roman pontiff's ſupremacy is expreſſed with more ſtrength and perſpicuity than that to Antonianus, from which our caſtigator garbles a paſſage for his purpoſe. Novatien, an anti-pope, the firſt of theſe miſcreants, whoſe ambition, under the maſk of zeal for reformation, had diſturbed the peace of the whole church, had written to Antonianus, then biſhop of Numidia, informing him of his pretended election to the pontificate, in place of Cornelius who had fallen into hereſy, as Novatien aſſerted, by communicating with Trophymus and others, who had ſacrificed to idols. Antonianus wrote to Cyprian on the ſubject, deſiring to know how Cornelius had admitted Trophymus to his communion, or what hereſy Novatien had introduced; Cyprian, in reply, ſhews that Cornelius was duly elected, innocent of the crimes with which Novatien charged him, that he was the true ſucceſſor of Peter, and his calumniator retrenched from the communion of the church: "Cornelius," ſays he, "was made biſhop when the place of Fabien, that is, the place of Peter, and the rank, 'gradus,' of the ſacerdotal chair was vacant..... As to what you have been told that Cornelius communicates indifferently with all thoſe, who have ſacrificed, it is a falſe report invented by apoſtates

apoſtates . . . . You aſk what hereſy Novatien has introduced. Know, in the firſt place, that we ought not enquire what he teaches, becauſe he teaches without the pale of the church, 'extra Eccleſiam.' There is but one church which Jeſus Chriſt has divided into many members throughout the world, and one epiſcopal order, 'epiſcopatus unus,' which is extended in the multitude of biſhops whom unanimity unites. Novatien, after the Divine inſtitution, endeavours to form *a human church*: he ſends new apoſtles into many cities to lay new foundations, and though there be of a long time paſt biſhops ordained in each Province, venerable for their age, for the integrity of their faith, and their conſtancy in perſecution, he dares to create other falſe biſhops."

Cyprian contraſts this human church of Novatien's invention, with the one church of Jeſus Chriſt entruſted to the care of Cornelius. Moreover this anti-pope pretended to depoſe all the biſhops in the different provinces who refuſed to acknowledge him, and to create biſhops in their ſtead. It was therefore the acknowledged right of the true Pope to depoſe biſhops for diſobedience and contumacy, and ſubſtitute others, or that artful intriguer would not attempt it.

In what that unity of the epiſcopal government conſiſts Cyprian explains, with accurate preciſion, in his treatiſe on the unity of the church. He begins by ſhewing the ſource of ſchiſm and hereſy: "this happens," ſays he, "becauſe recourſe is not had to the *ſource of truth*, becauſe the *Head* is not ſought, becauſe the doctrine of the Heavenly Maſter is not obſerved." He then aſſigns this *ſource of truth*, this *Head*: "Chriſt ſaid to Peter, 'thou art a rock, and on this rock I will build my church.' He built his church *on one*, and though after his reſurrection he gave to all his apoſtles equal power, yet to ſhew *the unity*, he eſtabliſhed *one chair*, and poſed the ſource of unity by making it deſcend from one, without doubt all the apoſtles were what Peter was: they

they partook of the ſame power, the ſame honour; but the beginning is from unity: *the primacy* was given to Peter, to ſhew that there is but one church of Jeſus Chriſt, and *one chair*. All are ſhepherds, there is but one flock, which all the apoſtles ought to feed with one accord ..... The epiſcopal order *is one*, of which each biſhop holds a portion in ſolidum."

To give his readers a correct idea of the unity of the church, to which the unity of the epiſcopal order is indiſpenſable, Cyprian compares it to a tree, the branches of which are united in the root; to light, all the rays of which are united in the ſun, the ſource of light; to many ſtreams of water flowing from the ſame ſpring; hence it follows that all ſpiritual powers, in the epiſcopal order, are radically in the chair of Peter; that from it all the powers of that order flow as the waters from the ſource; that in it all other epiſcopal chairs are united, as the branches of the tree are united in the root, from which they receive the nutritious juices. If a branch be ſeparated from the root, it muſt from all the other branches: for it is in the root and not elſewhere that all the branches of the tree unite; hence it follows that if an epiſcopal See be ſeparated from the See of Peter, it is from all other Sees in the church, and is no part nor portion of the one church of Jeſus Chriſt founded on Peter, and though the See of Peter be but a part of the church, it is it which gives life and energy to the whole, as the root, though but part of the tree, ſupports the whole tree, and conveys nutritious juices to all the branches.

"It will be granted," ſays the caſtigator, p. 88, "that Cyprian calls the church of Rome the See of Peter, and the principal church from which the unity of the prieſthood ariſes." He then fills a page with a paſſage in which Cyprian complains of an appeal to Rome, and ſays that every perſon's cauſe ſhould be examined where the crime is committed, then concludes that Cyprian calling the church of Rome the principal church, and

the ſpring of ſacerdotal unity, did not intend to aſcribe any ſupremacy to the Pope or his See. To this extraordinary aſſertion the writer makes no reply: he thinks hellebore or ſea-bathing may be uſeful: there is ſomething of madneſs in it. After the caſtigator has taken a few doſes of hellebore to purge his brain, let him conſult ſome ſchool-boy, who will tell him that principal and ſubordinate are correlatives; that when one is principal all others muſt be ſubordinate; he will alſo tell him that the ſtream is dependent on the ſpring, not the ſpring on the ſtream.

In the next page he gives the paſſage which the writer has cited from Cyprian's treatiſe on the unity of the church, omitting ſome ſentences, which the author of his repertory choſe to forget, and then with unbluſhing confidence tells this writer, that if he thinks Cyprian calls the church of Rome the principal church, in excluſion of all others, he is a ſtranger to the doctrine taught in the primitive church. If he will diſmiſs that ſpirit of divination, which dupes him ſo inceſſantly, and conſult Cyprian's works, he will find that venerable prelate, of the primitive times, profeſſedly demonſtrating, that the unity of Chriſt's church reſts on the epiſcopal chair of Peter; that in it all other churches, the integrant parts of that one whole, are united, as the branches of the tree in the root. Cyprian knew but one church, but one principal See, the root, from which all ſubordinate Sees derive their ſpiritual powers, as the branches draw their ſubſiſtence from the root, or as the ſtreams of water flow from the fountain, and this *principal See, this See of Peter*, he calls the Church of Rome, and what may appear extraordinary, the caſtigator admits it: "it will be granted," he ſays, p. 88, "*that Cyprian calls the church of Rome* the *See of Peter, the principal church from which the unity of the prieſthood ariſes.*"

Cyprian's diſpute with pope Stephen on the rebaptiſation of ſectaries, invalidates all that he has written on the primacy of the Roman church, if we believe the caſtigator

caſtigator. His reaſoning is as newly modelled as his religion, that is, Cyprian did not acquieſce in the pope's opinion, therefore he did not believe him ſucceſſor to St. Peter, nor his See, the principal See. Before the art of reaſoning had been new modelled, it was thought that Cyprian did not believe the pope infallible, nor think himſelf obliged to adopt, what he thought, an opinion, before the queſtion had been ſolemnly decided, thus St. Auſtin explains Cyprian's words in the Council—ſee remarks, p. 204. It may not be amiſs to inform the reader that in that celebrated controverſy Stephen's doctrine was apoſtolical, and his authority enforced it; Cyprian's opinion was new, introduced by his predeceſſor Agrippinus, as ſuch was condemned.

A defence of Stephen's doctrine, written at that time and yet extant, is of irreſiſtible force againſt all reformiſts; "there would be," ſays that writer, "no diſpute if each of us would reſt ſatisfied with the authority of all churches; and obſerving the maxims of humility make no attempt to innovate: for whatever is doubtful, if it be judged contrary to the ancient uſage of all our holy predeceſſors, ought to be rejected. There is nothing obtained from novelty, but that ſome individual is vaunted by ignorant, and inconſiderate people, as having corrected the errors of all churches. In this all ſectaries agree, their conſolation is to ſhew that they are not the only perſons who are in fault, and their whole ſtudy is to load the church with calumnies." In his next edition the caſtigator will ſhew the defects in the colouring of this picture. His invectives againſt popes, beginning with Peter; and the abuſe which he ſo liberally beſtows on monks and other eccleſiaſtics, of whom he knows nothing, are the ebullitions of his zeal, they are not to be claſſed with the calumnious miſrepreſentations of which that ancient writer ſpoke.

From Cyprian the caſtigator paſſes to Gregory the Great. The citations from the works of that moſt venerable pontiff anſwers ſeveral purpoſes; they fill ſome pages to

ſwell

ſwell the volume ; they make a diſplay of uncommon erudition ; they introduce anti-chriſt, an old and favorite theme. His ſpirit of divination forgot to remind him that theſe paſſages are ſtrongly tinctured with papal ſupremacy. In the firſt paſſage, p. 90, Gregory ſays : " though there were ſeveral apoſtles there is but *one apoſtolic See*, the See of the prince of the apoſtles." Of this he gives inconteſtible evidence in a few words, ſaying : " this See is in three places—in Rome, where he died ; in Alexandria, where it was founded by his diſciple Mark ; and in Antioch, where he reſided himſelf ſeven years :" theſe were the only patriarchal Sees which antiquity knew, and Gregory knew no other ; he, as well as Cyprian, thought the See of Peter the ſource of ſacerdotal unity ; and as Peter had founded the See of Antioch immediately by himſelf, and the See of Alexandria by his diſciple Mark, theſe Sees he conſidered excluſively as apoſtolical ; but as Peter did not tranſfer to Evodius, whom on his departure from Antioch, he appointed to govern that See, nor to Mark, who by his appointment governed the See of Alexandria, whilſt he himſelf governed the Roman See, his own commiſſion of feeding Chriſt's flock, in which theſe prelates, and the people they governed, were included, neither the See of Alexandria nor of Antioch was ever called the *principal See, the ſource of the prieſthood*, this title was reſerved for the Roman See, in which Peter cloſed his mortal career. Official authority deſcends to the ſucceſſor.

We are next favored with a long quotation, in which Gregory ſeverely cenſures John, patriarch of Conſtantinople, for aſſuming the title of *univerſal biſhop*, followed by an extract from the pontiff's letter to Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria, in which he refuſes that title offered by the patriarch, and calls him his brother. If aſſuming ignorance could excite any emotion but contempt, the writer would expreſs his ſurpriſe at ſeeing ſo many quotations, in which the exerciſe of the pontifi-

cal

cal authority is as manifeſt as the ſun at mid-day, offered as arguments againſt it. Gregory cenſured the patriarch of Conſtantinople in ſtrong terms for aſſuming a title, which did not belong to him in any ſenſe ; a title which he himſelf, and his predeceſſors, when offered in the Council of Chalcedon, and in one ſenſe, well founded, did not take, becauſe it might be underſtood in the ſenſe intended by this haughty prelate, to confine the prieſthood to one biſhop in excluſion of all others, a ſenſe in which the title did not belong to the patriarch, nor to the pontiff, nor to any other prelate on earth. Thus Gregory begins his letter to that patriarch : " you know what peace you found in the churches, and I do not know on what motive you pretend to aſſume a new name capable of offending all your brethren ; what aſtoniſhes me is, that you deſired to avoid the epiſcopal dignity, and now you intend to employ it, as if you had ſought it through ambition. You declared yourſelf unworthy the name of biſhop, and now you deſire to bear the name alone. My predeceſſor Pelagius wrote you a ſtrong letter on the ſubject ; he quaſhed the acts of the Council, which you held in the cauſe of our brother the biſhop Gregory, and forbid the arch-deacon, his nuncio, near the emperor, to aſſiſt at maſs with you. Since I have been called to the government of the church, I have directed my nuncios to ſpeak to you, and I now order the deacon Sabinien. Yet becauſe ſores muſt be lightly touched by the hand before the iron be applied, I pray you, I conjure you, I requeſt with all poſſible mildneſs, that you will reſiſt theſe flatterers, who give you a name full of extravagance and pride. Do not you know that the Council of Chalcedon offered that honor to the biſhops of Rome, calling them univerſal ? Yet not one of them would receive it, leſt he ſhould ſeem to attribute to himſelf alone the epiſcopal dignity, and take it from all his brethren." .... Lib. iv. Epis. 38.

In his letter to Sabinien, the nuncio, he informs him, that

that the patriarch had artfully engaged the emperor to write to himself to countenance that prelate's pretenſion: "he hopes," ſays he, "to authoriſe his vain pretenſion if I liſten to the emperor, and if I do not to irritate the emperor againſt me, but I walk in the ſtrait path and fear but God alone," Lib. iv. Ep. 39. In his anſwer to the emperor he ſays: "the conduct and primacy of the whole church was given to Peter, yet he is not called *univerſal apoſtle*. Europe is given up to barbarians, the cities are deſtroyed, fortreſſes ruined, provinces are ravaged, the lands are waſte, idolators are maſters of the lives of the faithful, and biſhops, who ought to lament proſtrate in aſhes, ſeek new titles to content their vanity. Is it my particular cauſe which I defend? Is it not the cauſe of God and of the univerſal church? We know that many biſhops of Conſtantinople have been not only heretics but hereſiarchs, as Neſtorius and Macedonius, if therefore he, who fills that See, were *univerſal biſhop* the whole church would fall with him. For me, I am the ſervant of all biſhops, whilſt they live as biſhops .... to obey your orders I have written to him with mildneſs and humility, if he hears me, he ſhall have in me a brother entirely devoted, if not he will have for adverſary him, who reſiſts the proud," iv Ep. 32.

This title which Gregory's predeceſſors did not aſſume, though offered in the Council of Chalcedon, he himſelf rejected, when offered by Eulogius, the then patriarch of Alexandria, the moſt learned and pious prelate of the day. From the extract of a letter quoted by the caſtigator, p. 93, it appears that Eulogius thought Gregory had given him an order in a former letter. It muſt have been a requeſt, which coming from his ſuperior, Eulogius conſidered as an order. He therefore acknowledged Gregory's ſpiritual juriſdiction over the See of Alexandria, the ſecond See, a patriarchal See of the moſt extenſive juriſdiction, whilſt Conſtantinople was yet ſubject to the metropolitan See of Heraclea.

"But Gregory ſays that he did not command him, calls him

him in rank his brother, in manners his father." What then? The modeſty which he recommended to others, he practiſed. But will this caſtigator pretend that Eulogius did not think Gregory his ſuperior? That he did not think him ſuperior to all other prelates when he called him *univerſal pope*? Or will he pretend that the paſſage, as cited by himſelf, does not contain concluſive evidence of Gregory's univerſal juriſdiction? He ſays to Eulogius: "*nothing can redound to my honour, which conduces to the diſhonour of my brethren. I place my honour in maintaining them in theirs.*" Is not this the language of a man veſted with authority to ſupport all biſhops in their reſpective ranks? Is this caſtigator ſo perverſely obſtinate or ſo crazy as to deny it.

In imitation of other prophets in theſe reforming times, who run without being ſent, the caſtigator pronounces the immediate deſtruction of popery. A true diſciple of John Knox, he exultingly deſires the writer to caſt his eyes on what is called the Chriſtian world, and obſerve if the proteſtant intereſt or papal authority be in the moſt declining condition, p. 94. The writer has to lament the deſtruction of the human ſpecies, in many Catholic States, effected by the late revolution in Europe, confeſſedly the work of our lateſt reformiſts; he has alſo to lament that this deſtruction was not confined to Catholic Staes excluſively, ſome Proteſtant States on the Continent ſhared the ſame fate. This is no ſubject of exultation, if not to the emiſſaries of Abaddon, the enemy of man. If by the proteſtant intereſt, the caſtigator underſtands the eſtabliſhed Church of England, the writer begs leave to inform him, that the Catholics of the United Kingdom look with horror and diſmay on the breaches, which are daily making in that national ſtructure by the caſtigator's friends, enthuſiaſts and fanatics of different deſcriptions, from whoſe aſcendancy, if once eſtabliſhed, catholics have every thing to fear and nothing to expect. He has alſo to remark to him, that this ſpirit of divination, which the caſtigator has

foolishly mistaken for a spirit of prophecy, is a lying spirit: for the papal authority in spirituals, the only authority which the pope of Divine right and institution possesses, was never more extensive, more universally acknowledged, nor more firmly established, than on the presentday. If the castigator does not know it, it is because he knows nothing of the present state of the Christian world. If he looks to the East and West, to the North and South, he will see to his great astonishment, and no small mortification, the kingdom of Jesus Christ, that is the catholic church, composed of pastors in regular succession since the apostles days, and their respective portions of the flock, in some countries in splendour, in others depressed, but in all nations visible, as it was from the commencement, literally verifying the promise of Jesus Christ, that he himself would be with the pastors of his church, teaching all nations to the extremities of the earth, and to the end of time, Matt. xxvii. 19. 20, whilst ephemeral sects, suddenly emerging as if from the regions of darkness, pass like a meteor and then disappear, or like flies, which buzz in the sun-shine, fall, and are heard of no more. Some hundreds have already passed into oblivion, and if we may judge by analogy the same fate awaits them all.

From his spirit of divination, no doubt, he has learned that St. John called the church of Rome, founded by the apostles Peter and Paul, and then governed by pastors of their immediate institution, Babylon. Men who judge by the rules of common sense think that the evangelist spoke of the Roman empire, of which that city was then the capital, and mistress of the civilized world. Against this idolatrous city the apostle denounced the Divine vengeance, and his prediction has been literally verified. Near the close of the fourth century, the Huns, the Vandals, the Goths, and other barbarians, had successively ravaged the different provinces of the empire, Germany, Gaul, Spain, Italy and Africa. The Lombards had established themselves in Italy, and the

Goths

Goths in Spain. The ſoldiers of this laſt nation, who had ſerved in the Roman armies, ſuſpected of being ſecretly in the intereſt of Stilicon, after his death were harſhly treated: in ſome towns their wives and children were put to death, and their poſſeſſions confiſcated contrary to the public faith which had been pledged. Enraged at this infraction of a ſolemn treaty, they united under Alaric, the moſt powerful and warlike of their chiefs. He conducted them to the gates of Rome. It is ſaid of him by Socrates and Sozomen, that on his way he had ſaid, that it was not of his own movement, but that ſomething preſſed him and tormented him ſaying: go and pillage Rome. He beſieged the city ſo cloſely that both famine and peſtilence began their ravages. In that extremity the Heathen ſenators thought it neceſſary to ſacrifice on the capitol and in the other temples. The Tuſcan ſoothſayers promiſed to chaſe the barbarians with thunder and lightening, but Vulcan had ceaſed to forge the bolts, and Jupiter's thunder was heard no more. His golden goblets proved more effectual. Alaric agreed to raiſe the ſiege on condition that the city would furniſh five thouſand pounds of gold, thirty thouſand pounds of ſilver, four thouſand tunicks of ſilk, three thouſand hides, of a ſcarlet die, and three thouſand pounds of pepper. As the money was not in the treaſury, the citizens were taxed; the ornaments of the temples, and the idols of gold and ſilver were melted down to ſupply the deficiency. Zozimus, the heathen hiſtorian, laments the deſtruction of the idols; he complains that ſince the idol of the goddeſs of virtue was melted down, virtue itſelf was extinguiſhed in the breaſts of the Romans. The intelligent reader need not be told that, the Heathens deified virtues as well as vices. This was but the commencement of that puniſhment, which Divine juſtice had prepared for that idolatrous city, in which temples were erected to pretended Gods, more vicious than the infatuated mortals who adored them.

Alaric according to agreement drew off his troops; but ſoon after, taking offence at ſome imprudent expreſſions of Jovius, prefect of Italy, in a conference with him, he reſumed the ſiege, obliged the Romans to declare Attalus, one of his creatures, emperor, and in the courſe of the ſame year depoſed him. Not long after, whilſt treating with the emperor Honorius, Sarus, a barbarian chieftain, allied to the Romans, ſurpriſed ſome of his ſoldiers, and cut them to pieces. Alaric, full of indignation, broke off the treaty, returned to Rome, recommenced the ſiege, took the city by treachery on the 24th of Auguſt, 410, in the 1164th year of its foundation; gave it up to pillage, yet, in reſpect to the apoſtle Peter, he ordered the church called the Vatican to be a place of refuge. St. Jerom deſcribes this tragical event in his letter to Principia: "a terrible report," ſays he, "is come from the Weſt that Rome was beſieged; that the ſafety of the citizens was purchaſed with gold; that ſpoiled, they were again beſieged, and that after having loſt their all, they loſt their lives. Voice fails! Sighs interrupt words! The city is taken, which took the world, it periſhed with hunger before it periſhed with the ſword; few were found to be taken; the rage of hunger ſeized on food, which is not to be named; the mother did not ſpare the infant at her breaſt..... who can deſcribe the ravages, the maſſacres of that night? Who can equal his ſorrows with his tears? The ancient city falls; the city which had reigned ſo many years! Lifeleſs bodies are ſcattered without number on the ways, and the image of death in the houſes." This tremendous puniſhment, which St. John denounced againſt idolators, who had tinged the whole earth with the blood of Chriſtians; who had made the moſt ſtrenuous and perſevering exertions, during four ſucceding ages, to exterminate chriſtianity, and which, when the meaſure of their iniquity was full, the Divine juſtice did inflict in the moſt terrible manner. The caſtigator, in his new modelled zeal, exults in the hope of ſeeing it renewed on Chriſtians

tians. The writer ventures to assure him that, however alarming this punishment may appear, a punishment infinitely greater, and of greater duration, is reserved for these, who under the mask of religious zeal, fill the minds of the uninformed with rancorous prejudices against their brethren. "Six things God hates, the seventh is the abomination of his soul," that is, they who sow discord amongst the brethren, Pro. vi. 16. He may exult with certainty in the hope of seeing this punishment inflicted in due time, and console himself for his former disappointment.

This anti-christ of modern invention, which exists but in the imagination of fools and fanatics, has been a necessary instrument in forming that elaborate structure, which our first reformists raised, and he is equally necessary to their successors for the support of its tottering remains: Vossius, a learned and unprejudiced protestant, who was in error but through the accident of his birth, and who in all his writings had truth in view, disgusted at the violent declamations which incessantly assaulted his ears, from the different pulpits in Holland, in which nothing was heard but invectives against the *pope*, the *anti-christ*, the *son of perdition*, &c. and the Romish church, the *Babylon*, the *great whore*, as the castigator modestly translates, asked one of the ministers why he did not chuse some other subject for the instruction of the people, to which the minister replied, that if the people were not taught to believe that the pope is anti christ, they would all turn papists again. The minister's opinion was better founded than Vossius thought it: for if it be true, that the pope is not anti-christ, it is therefore true, that Luther and all his brother reformists were impostors, and their disciples and successors are dupes, that their new-fangled system is founded on manifest imposture, in support of which no dispassionate and disinterested man of common sense would risk his reputation, much less his salvation. The reader is referred to Pastorinis's History of the christian

church,

church: in it he will find the true character of the anti-chriſt deſcribed by the apoſtles, as oppoſite to the fancied anti-chriſt of the epicurean monk, and his aſſociates, as the licentiouſneſs of their pretended goſpel is to the ſeverity of the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt. Cloſing his pretended proofs againſt the ſupremacy, adduced from Gregory's works, the caſtigator, whoſe memory plays the truant at times, calls this pontiff: *learned and judicious*, and almoſt in the ſame ſentence adds, that like many other *ignorant and well meaning perſons* he happened to ſtumble on truth. Thus this ſcribbling caſtigator, who never ſtumbles on truth, with one ſtroke of his pen, converts a *learned and judicious man*, into an *ignorant* and *well meaning man*, who happens to ſtumble on truth.

In his next chapter, p. 96, he introduces the temporal authority claimed by ſome popes. This part of the ſupremacy he ſays is *indirectly denied by the writer*, then quotes from his *Remarks*, p. 72, a long paſſage, in which it is aſſerted: "that Mr. Burke has ſhewn in his *Letter of Inſtruction* that the pope does not poſſeſs an atom of civil authority, or temporal juriſdiction, beyond the territories which he governs as a temporal prince." This he calls *attempting to deny it indirectly!* and in this *indirect denial*, his ſpirit of divination diſcovers an *inſinuation* that popes formerly made no ſuch claim. If he had not been infatuated by his lying ſpirit, he might like other *ignorant and well meaning men, ſometimes ſtumble on truth*; he might have ſeen in the writer's words, not an inſinuation that ſome popes did not claim a temporal juriſdiction, but the contrary inſinuation, that they did. If he had read the work which he pretends to refute, he would have found not an inſinuation, but a poſitive aſſertion that ſome popes did claim a temporal juriſdiction, "*ſo true it is that this power which ſome popes pretended to aſſume was never believed to exiſt but in their ambition,*"—Review, p. 71, and a direct denial of any temporal juriſdiction whatever being veſted in the pope as

firſt paſtor of the church, a truth which he might have ſeen eſtabliſhed in Mr. B's Letter of Inſtruction, p. 22 .... 34, not by coarſe invectives, but by concluſive reaſoning. His extract of hiſtory ſhewing that popes eſtabliſhed ſome kings, and dethroned others, only proves that popes were always thought ſuperior to all other prelates, and that at times extending this juriſdiction, which they were known and univerſally acknowledged to poſſeſs, beyond its due limits, they made encroachments, on the temporal juriſdiction of princes, which they never did of divine right poſſeſs; but which they might at any time obtain from the common conſent of princes and people, in whom all temporal juriſdiction and civil authority is originally veſted by the author of ſociety, and by whom it may be conferred on any pope, prince or potentate.

In his great zeal to excite a horror of this bug-bear popery, which haunts his diſturbed imagination on theſe tedious hours from which curtain lectures baniſh reſt, he informs us that Alphonſus was raiſed to the dignity of King in Portugal, in 1179, by the Roman Pontiff Alexander III. the ſame regal dignity was conferred on Primiſlaus, Duke of Bohemia, by Innocent III. in 1204, and Johannius, duke of Bulgaria and Wallachia, was made king by the ſame pontiff in 1220, he ſays, that Stephen grand jucan of Servia, was crowned by the authority of Honorius III. that Boleſlaus of Poland was deprived of his regal dignity by the then pope, and Roger, count of Sicily, was made king of Sicily. If he had been diligent in his reſearches he might have found that Leo III. made Charlemain emperor in 801, and Zachary made Pepin his father king of the Franks in 752,—See Review, p. 52. It is true he tells us that he can preſent a liſt of one hundred princes, who have been excommunicated and depoſed by popes, and double the number might be collected with very little labour, p. 109, he thus injudiciouſly informs his readers that the pope's ſpiritual authority was well and univerſally eſta-

bliſhed

bliſhed in the chriſtian world, ſome centuries before Luther and his brother reformiſts were born, for this temporal authority, which they unwarrantably aſſumed, could have no other foundation or pretext but the ſpiritual authority with which they were in reality inveſted: they abuſed this power. Some did it is true, that only proves the power to exiſt: for if it did not it could not be abuſed. There have been ſome writers who maintained the depoſing power. Yes, as a matter of opinion, which no catholic ever was obliged to believe, which the whole ſchool of French divines, truly catholic, reprobate—See Review, p. 2, and which was conſidered as an uſurpation. In the firſt inſtance that of the Emperor Henry IV. *Otho Friſingenſis*, a catholic prelate, well affected to the See of Rome, ſays: "the empire was indignant at this novelty, as no ſuch ſentence had ever been publiſhed againſt an emperor of Rome," vi. Epr. C. 35.

To give his readers an idea of a popiſh excommunication he fills three pages with a ſcurrilous fiction, in which the coarſeſt and moſt offenſive terms in the Engliſh language are introduced. He then repeats, with additional virulence, the hackneyed tales of Raymond, of Thouloufe; of the Albigenſes, &c. of the Councils of Conſtance and Latran, all which the writer has already diſcuſſed in his different replies to the Rev. Mr. Cochran—See them in the Review.

From his ſpirit of divination he has learned, and confidently aſſerts, that theſe wicked popes and papiſts for whom he has the neweſt modelled charity, have maſſacred fifty millions of people. What a pity that this venerable teacher of the neweſt ſchool, inflamed with pious zeal againſt theſe wicked papiſts, had not lived in the famed John Knox's reforming days; to the warlike blaſts of John's trumpet, he would have added the deep, the ſhrill, and terrific ſound of *Alecto's horn*, and he would have brought *Jezabel*, as that ruffian called the queen, to the block in her own capital. Even George Gordon's

Gordon's days are paſt! The writer has already diſcuſſed theſe pretended maſſacres, the Gun Powder Plot, &c. in his Review, which this caſtigator pretends to refute, though it appears that he has not read a line of it. A refutation of all the calumnies which fill the century writers' maſſive volumes, and Bower's leaden lives of popes, would be an endleſs and an uſeleſs work, which the writer will not undertake. He whiſpers in the caſtigator's ear that there have been many bad popes, bad biſhops, and prieſts, in the chriſtian church, and ſome good ones; and he adds, for this caſtigator's conſolation, that any conventicle in which there is neither pope nor biſhop is not a chriſtian church. Not to know this plain ſimple truth is intolerable ignorance, to know it and conceal it from an uninformed well meaning people, is ſomething worſe than ignorance.

"It can be ſhewn, by moſt authentic documents," he ſays, p. 111, "that the aſſaſſinations of princes, the bloody maſſacres, and the cruel perſecutions, which grace the annals of modern Europe, either have been the devices of popes, or received their approbation." He has not produced one of theſe authentic inſtruments: it would be a curious ſtate paper. Will he deign to tell us, what pope ſent Charles I. to the block? What pope deviſed the death of Mary, queen of Scots, of Lewis XVI. of the duke d'Enghien? Who adviſed the cool diſpaſſionate murder of Beton, archbiſhop of St. Andrew's, primate of Scotland? Some pious reformiſts, enflamed with holy zeal, kindled by one of *Knox's* memorable *blaſts*, entered the epiſcopal palace, and, having prevailed on that prelate, by entreaties and promiſes, to open the chamber door, in which he had barricaded himſelf, they ruſhed in—the ſcene is thus deſcribed by one of themſelves: "they found him ſitting in his chair, he ſaid to them: I am a prieſt, I am a prieſt, do not kill me, John Leſley according to ancient vows, (it ſeems he had ſworn to do it) ſtruck him firſt, and gave him one or two ſtrokes, as did Peter Carmichael, but James Melvin,

vin, a man of a mild diſpoſition, and very modeſt, thinking they were both angry, ſtopped them ſaying: this work and the judgment of God ought to be done with great gravity, then preſenting the point of his ſword to the cardinal, he ſaid to him: repent of your paſt wicked life . . . . . we are ſent by God for the puniſhment of it: for I proteſt here in preſence of my God, that neither hatred of your perſon, nor love of your riches, nor fear of any evil, which you can do me in particular, have engaged me, or engage me now to ſtrike you, but only becauſe you have been, and you are yet, an obſtinate enemy to Jeſus Chriſt and his goſpel, (that is Knox's new goſpel) then he thruſt his ſword two or three times through his body"—See Hiſt. of Scot. Ref. London, 1644, p. 72, ſuppoſed to be written by John Knox himſelf. Never was repentance preached in this form before; nor murder committed with ſuch meekneſs and modeſty. Such were the diſciples of John Knox, whoſe ſpirit ſeems revived in this Edinburgh caſtigator.

In one of theſe ſanctified *blaſts* which that noted reformiſt ſtiled an *Admonition to the Nobles and People of Scotland*, ſpeaking of the neighbouring country, he ſays: "I will boldly aſſure it, that the Gentlemen, the Governors, the Judges and the People of England, ought not only to reſiſt Mary their Queen, *that new Jezabel*, as ſoon as ſhe began to extinguiſh the goſpel, but alſo to put her to death, with all her prieſts, *and all thoſe who enter into her views.*" Thus this new modelled apoſtle, of true Mahometan breed, conſigns to the ſhades, in bulk, both princes and people, indiſcriminately, all, who oppoſe, what he calls, the goſpel. Theſe are authentic documents which ſhew how truly Eraſmus ſaid: "this new goſpel makes men ſurpaſs themſelves in wickedneſs."

However, the caſtigator's invectives againſt popes are derived from a higher ſource: Luther, the great patriarch of reforming memory, in one of theſe Theſes, publiſhed

publiſhed in 1540, ſays: the pope is a ſorcerer *(loup garou)* poſſeſſed by an evil ſpirit. All towns and cities ought to collect in troops againſt him, it is not neceſſary to wait the authority of Judges or Council againſt him, nor to pay any attention to the Judge, who would forbid him to be killed. If the Judge or the peaſants are themſelves killed in the tumult by the people, who purſue this monſter, it is what they deſerve, there is no injury done them. We are not to enquire if the pope is ſupported by princes, by kings, or by emperors themſelves: he who fights under a robber *is fallen from military command*, as well as from ſalvation." If there be truth in hiſtory theſe documents are authentic, it is therefore true, that the apoſtles of the reformation in Germany and Scotland, taught rebellion, authoriſed murders, maſſacres, aſſaſſinations of princes, &c. with which, this caſtigator, with true pharaſaical confidence charges popes; nor does he confine the charge to popes alone; he charitably extends it to all popiſh magiſtrates: "what elſe," ſays he, "are magiſtrates under the influence of the Romiſh religion but the creatures of the pope?"—p. 111. The Phariſees in their accuſation againſt Paul, Acts xxiv, 5, ſay: "we found this man peſtilential, moving ſedition amongſt all the Jews".....

Were the Lords and Commons in Edward III. days, who paſſed the famous ſtatutes of *premunire* and *proviſors*, creatures of the pope? They were papiſts as well as their fellow ſubjects. Were the Lords and Commons, who depoſed Richard II. creatures of the pope? They alſo were papiſts, yet one of the articles of impeachment againſt Richard, ſhews to conviction that they were not creatures of the pope. The article is thus conceived: "though the Crown of England, and all the rights of the Crown, and the Kingdom itſelf, hath been in all paſt time ſo free that the ſupreme pontiff (Dominus ſummus Pontifex) or any other perſon without the kingdom, ought not to interfere with the ſame *(ſe intro mittere de eiſdem)*

eiſdem) the ſaid king, for the ſtrengthening of his erroneous ſtatutes, did ſupplicate the pope to confirm the acts paſſed in the laſt Parliament," ſo true it is that England, whilſt a Catholic State, never believed the pope to poſſeſs any temporal juriſdiction within the realm. Theſe Lords and Commons ſo hoſtile to the pope's prétenſions were the men, who a few years after the depoſition of Richard, in the days of Henry V, paſſed the ſanguinary laws which condemned the Lollards to the ſtake.

The writer is willing to admit that ſome popes have been as ſanguinary as John Knox himſelf, even as Calvin, his maſter, who religiouſly roaſted Michael Servetus for preſuming to take the ſcriptures alone for his rule of faith, a doctrine which he had learned from Calvin. He is alſo willing to admit that ſome papiſts have been as *meek* and *modeſt* aſſaſſins as James Melvin. Does it follow that murder, rebellion or aſſaſſination, is authoriſed by any tenet of catholic doctrine, or any maxim of its morality? The contrary has been ſhewn to conviction in Mr. B's. reply to Palæologus's third letter, to which the reader is referred—See Review, p 55.

Some popes have been ſuſpected, perhaps not without ſtrong reaſons, of being addicted to avarice, to ambition, ſenſuality and intemperance. What then? Are theſe vices authoriſed or converted into virtues? No. It is the glory of the catholic doctrine, to condemn every poſſible vice, and enforce every poſſible virtue; it knows no diſtinction of perſons in the ſeverity of its morality: it condemns vice in the prince as in the peaſant; in the pope and biſhop as in the ſoldier or the ſailor. The man who does not know this, does not know it. The man who knows it, and unbluſhingly affirms the contrary, does not know the truth. It is not in the catholic church that we learn to believe that vice diveſts the civil magiſtrate or the ſpiritual ſuperior of that authority with which he is legally inveſted. This is one of theſe new fangled doctrines invented by Wiclef, taught by John Huſs and by Luther, taught and reduced to practice by

John

John Knox and his reforming colleagues, a doctrine anathematiſed by the Council of Conſtance, and by all catholics; condemned by the apoſtolical writings, ſubverſive of order and ſubordination, and deſtructive of ſociety—See Review, p. 55.

After filling ſome pages with garbled extracts from the Councils of Lateran and Conſtance, which have been already adduced by Pælaologus in his letters, and diſcuſſed by Mr. B. in his replies—See Review. The caſtigator concludes that there is no dependance to be placed on popiſh oaths of allegiance, p. 120. This modeſt aſſertion he pretends to ſhew by a paſſage from Paſchenius, of whom this writer knows nothing. Whether the paſſage be genuine or fictitious, it is uſeleſs to enquire. It contains the opinion of an ignorant individual, which from the obſcurity of the author, or the turbulence of the times, has perhaps eſcaped cenſure. Does this caſtigator know that catholics do not permit loquacious demagogues to ſubſtitute the ravings of their imagination to the ſettled doctrines of the church? This is a privilege which they have long ſince reſigned to enthuſiac ramblers in the regions of fancy, which they now confirm to the caſtigator, to Sandiman, to ſalvation Murray, Jemima Wilkinſon, and Co.

He tells us that Paſchenius ſaid the papiſts were not obliged to pay allegiance to king James I. becauſe the pope had declared the oath unjuſt. If he had told us that papiſts in England did not obſerve their oath of allegiance to their prince, we ſhould conclude, not that the oath was unjuſt, but that they were guilty of perjury, who tranſgreſſed it; however, King James, who thought himſelf happy in eſcaping the plots of reformiſts in Scotland, brought no ſuch accuſation againſt his catholic ſubjects in England. After the pretended Gun Powder Plot, the machiavelian artifice of which was ſoon diſcovered by the king, and is now well known to every man of information in England, in his proclamation of the 7th of November, 1605, James ſays: "we are by good expe-

rience

rience ſo well perſuaded of the loyalty of divers ſubjects of the Romiſh religion, that they do abhor this deteſtable conſpiracy as ourſelf . . . . ."—See Review, p. 78.

Will this Edinburgh caſtigator condeſcend to tell us what pope declared null and void the oath of allegiance, which his anceſtors had ſworn to Mary their queen, whoſe title to the Scottiſh throne was never doubted? Were they papiſts, who dethroned her? Were they papiſts, who perſecuted her with relentleſs fury, until ſhe died on the ſcaffold? Were they papiſts, who regardleſs of their oath of allegiance, and of every other tie, even of common decency, brought her grand-ſon, the unfortunate Charles, to the block? Was it not pope Knox, from whom this caſtigator dates his pedigree, who taught the holy duty of perjury and inſurrection in defence of his new goſpel, though Jeſus Chriſt, the author of the goſpel, had ſtrictly enjoined obedience to a heathen emperor, and his apoſtles had as ſtrictly enjoined the ſame obedience to the moſt ferocious of all heathen princes, and the moſt furious perſecutor of the goſpel, *Nero*? Is the man ſo crazy as to deny what the world knows? With what unbluſhing effrontery then does he impute to us a doctrine, which we deteſt, and which it is known to the world that his anceſtors taught and acted on?

In the next page, after having compoſed a creed for us, of ſuch materials as could have been gleaned, garbled and faſhioned by Illyricus and his aſſociates, the caſtigator, modeſtly enough, ſays that: "by this view of Romiſh principles he would not be thought to charge the papiſts of Nova-Scotia with diſloyalty." They thank him; but hold! They muſt not be profuſe in their gratitude: his conſcience is tender, his charity exceſſive, he corrects the exceſs by a certain reſtriction: "but until the church of Rome come forward collectively, and abjure her former opinions [this will not happen] their loyalty is at war with the principles of their religion [with the religion which the caſtigator lends them] and the Legiſlature

Legiſlature can only conſider them as Samſon at the mill-ſtones." [this caſtigator hates perſecution]. The writer begs leave to inform him that the opinions of individuals compoſe no part of the doctrines of the church of Rome; that the doctrine of that church is ſettled and invariably independant on opinions. As he has already given the anſwer of ſix foreign catholic univerſities, in which the creed compoſed for our uſe by the caſtigator, and his friends, and theſe pretended Romiſh principles which they have gleaned, are unequivocally condemned, the writer does not think it neceſſary to repeat what he has already ſaid on the ſubject, however, there is a part of the anſwer of Alcala ſo ſtrictly applicable to this Edinburgh caſtigator, that the writer begs leave to inſert it.

Anſwer to the Third Queſtion:

"So perſuaded is the univerſity that a doctrine which would exempt catholics from keeping faith with heretics, or other perſons, diſſenting from them in religious matters, ſo far from being an article of the catholic faith, is entirely repugnant to its tenets, that ſhe could not have believed it poſſible there ſhould exiſt any perſons, who would dare to impute to catholics any thing ſo iniquitous, had ſhe not learned from the ſacred ſcriptures, that the ſame Phariſees, who had heard the Lord openly commanding to give to "*Cæſar the things that are Cæſar's*," afterwards laid this very crime to his charge: "*we have found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæſar*;" but the Devil, who moved their tongues to utter ſuch falſehoods, has never deſiſted from perverting others in like manner:"

What if the univerſity had heard this Edinburgh caſtigator inflated with pious zeal, emitting from his hallowed throat this oracle: "*the Romiſh church opens the gates of Heaven to thieves, robbers, murderers, and ſinners of all deſcriptions, who would only embrue their hands in the blood of a heretic*," p. 114? They would have ſaid that

the

the maniac had ſuperſeded the *Pythoniſſa** of *Delphos*, and was agitated by the ſame ſpirit. The writer however diſſents: he does not even think him a fortune-teller, though he acknowledges his great powers of divination; thanks to that ſpirit, which aſſiſts him, whether it be the ſpirit of the delphic Pythoniſſa, of the witch of Endor, or of Saul, he leaves that to the univerſity to decide.

In Catholic States, thieves, robbers and murderers are diſmiſſed from their labours in this life, as in England, by the finiſher of the law.

He would adviſe the caſtigator to read ſome treatiſe on morality, though it were but a paraphraſe on the alcoran. He may perchance learn a truth of which he ſeems extremely ignorant, that is, atrocious facts are not proved by bold aſſertions, with their uſual accompaniments, petulance and effrontery. Theſe only expoſe the weakneſs of the head, or the malignity of the heart, which are not unfrequently combined.

This caſtigator expreſſes great indignation at Mr. B's want of candour, in refuſing to acknowledge that to break faith with heretics has been a long time a maxim believed and practiſed by the church of Rome. It ſeems Mr. B. inſtructing the catholic miſſionaries of Nova-Scotia, did not think proper to adopt this new modelled doctrine, compoſed by the caſtigator and co. for their uſe. He even condemned it expreſsly, as a doctrine which no man of common ſenſe, or common honeſty, ever believed. It was cruel in him to deprive the caſtigator of a favorite topic, on which he might exerciſe his talent of railing againſt the perfidy of papiſts. He complains that the phraſe which Mr. B. ignorantly or cunningly produces does not exhibit the doctrine of the church of Rome in its true colours. He muſt, he ſays, be

NOTE OF THE EDITOR.

* The Pythoniſſa was the prieſteſs of Apollo, who propheſied in the temple at Delphos: to deliver her oracles, ſhe placed herſelf on a ſtool, covered with the ſkin of the ſerpent Pythos, worked herſelf into a ſort of frenzy, ſpoke in ſhrill and broken ſounds, with horrible convulſions.

be an ignorant prieſt, who does not know that the phraſe uſed by the church is not: "non eſt habenda fides," but "non eſt ſervanda fides hereticis." It ſeems Mr. B. did not know it. He had not the good fortune to conſult the caſtigator's repertory, or his ſpirit of divination. He may think Mr. B's. ignorance excuſable, when he finds that not one catholic univerſity in Europe knew it, the writer moſt certainly does not know it, and after the ſolemn declaration of the univerſities of *Paris*, of *Dovay*, of *Louvain*, of *Alcala*, *Salamanca* and *Valladolid*, which this caſtigator might have ſeen in the work which he pretends to refute, that no ſuch doctrine is or ever was taught in the church, he muſt ſay that to impute ſuch a doctrine to the church is not the effect of ſheer ignorance, but impudent impoſture.

He cites an epiſtle of Martin V. to the duke of Lithuania, ſaying: that he ſins mortally if he keeps faith with heretics. The original perhaps may be found in Edinburgh, it is not amongſt that pontiff's authentic papers. If it had been authentic, of which there is no appearance, it would only ſhew that the pope in a private letter, like other politicians, obſerved a maxim, which in his official capacity, as Head of the Church, he had ſolemnly condemned. In his Bull, approved by the Council of Conſtance, we find this queſtion propoſed to perſons ſuſpected of hereſy: "whether he does not think that all *willful perjury* committed upon any occaſion whatſoever, for the preſervation of one's life, or another man's, or even *for the ſake of faith*, be a mortal ſin."—See Review, p. 69.

If the paſſages, which he cites from two or three obſcure authors, be genuine, which this writer doubts very much, he has only to remark that ſuch works if known to the proper judges would be condemned, and the authors obliged to retract, or be retrenched from the catholic communion. If he be diligent in his reſearches he may find amongſt propoſitions extracted from the works

works of catholic writers, and juridically condemned, materials to form as great a variety of creeds as are to be found amongſt all the diſcordant religious ſocieties of the United Kingdom, Queſnel alone will furniſh him with one hundred, in which there is juſt as much truth as in this caſtigator's invectives.

In vindication of theſe authors, whom the writer does not know, and of whom in all appearance this Edinburgh caſtigator knows as little, it muſt be ſaid that a man, who with unbluſhing confidence and a ſteeled conſcience, falſifies the ſcriptures, ſubſtituting *eidōlon* to *eikōn*, that is, *idol* to *image*, a man, who notoriouſly garbles the works of the Fathers which are to be found in all libraries, has not been ſcrupulouſly ſparing of works of ſuch obſcurity, as to make it doubtful if they exiſt at all.

The reader is informed that the anſwers of the univerſities were given at the deſire of that great Stateſman Mr. Pitt, and are cited in the Hiſtory of the Penal Laws, by Henry Parnell, Eſq. p. 148 . . . . and in the appendix to Sir J. C. Hippiſley's Obſervations, p. 76, both Members of the Imperial Parliament.

To the declaration of the univerſities the writer ſubjoins a declaration of greater weight if poſſible, that is, the declaration of Pius VI. of venerable memory, in a Letter to the Roman Catholic Biſhops of Ireland.—The Letter Hip. p. 77.

" The Roman Catholic Archbiſhops of Ireland, at their meeting in Dublin, in 1791, addreſſed a letter to the Pope, wherein they deſcribed the miſrepreſentations that had been recently publiſhed of their conſecration oath, and the great injury to the Catholic body, ariſing from them . . . . . .

" After due deliberation at Rome, the Congregation of Cardinals appointed to ſuperintend the eccleſiaſtical affairs of theſe kingdoms, returned an anſwer (of which the following is an extract) by the authority and command of his Holineſs :

" *Moſt*

" *Moſt Illuſtrious and moſt Reverend Lords, and*
" *Brothers**,

" We perceive from your late letter, the great uneaſineſs you labour under ſince the publication of a pamphlet, entitled, *The preſent ſtate of the Church of Ireland*, —from which our detractors have taken occaſion to renew the old calumny againſt the Catholic Religion with increaſed acrimony; namely, *that this religion is by no means compatible with the ſafety of kings and republics; becauſe, as they ſay, the Roman Pontiff being the father and maſter of all Catholics, and inveſted with ſuch great authority, that he can free the ſubjects of other kingdoms from their fidelity and oaths of allegiance to kings and princes*; he has it in his power, they contend, to cauſe diſturbances and injure the public tranquility of kingdoms, with eaſe. We wonder that you could be uneaſy at theſe complaints, eſpecially after your moſt excellent brother and apoſtolical fellow-labourer, the Archbiſhop of Caſhel †, and other ſtrenuous defenders of the rights of the Holy See, had evidently refuted, and explained away theſe ſlanderous reproaches, in their celebrated writings."—In this controverſy a moſt accurate diſcrimination ſhould be made between the genuine rights of the Apoſtolical See, and thoſe that are imputed to it by innovators of this age for the purpoſe of calumniating *The See of Rome never taught, that faith is not to be kept with the heterodox:—that an oath to kings ſeparated from the Catholic Communion, can be violated:—that it is lawful for the Biſhop of Rome to invade their temporal rights and dominions.* We *too* conſider *an attempt or deſign againſt the life of Kings and Princes even under the pretext of religion, as an* HORRID *and* DETESTABLE CRIME."

" His Holineſs, Pius VI. has not, however, diſregarded your

* The original Latin will be found in oppoſite columns in Dr. Troy's Paſtoral Inſtruction, 1793.—(Coghlan, Duke-ſtreet)

† Dr. James Butler.

your requeſts; and therefore, in order to effectually remove every occaſion of cavil and calumny, which, as you write, ſome borrow from the words in the form of oath of obedience to the Apoſtolical See, that Biſhops are required to take at their conſecration.—*I will proſecute** *and oppoſe heretics, &c. to the utmoſt of my power*; which words are maliciouſly interpreted as the ſignal of war againſt heretics, authoriſing perſecution and aſſault againſt them, as enemies; whereas the purſuit and oppoſition to heretics, which the Biſhops undertake, are to be underſtood as referring to their ſolicitude and efforts in convincing heretics of their errors, and procuring their reconciliation with the Catholic Church: his Holineſs has graciouſly condeſcended to ſubſtitute in place of the ancient form of oath, that one which was publicly repeated by the Archbiſhop of *Mohilow*, to the great ſatisfaction of all the Court of Peterſburgh, in preſence of the Empreſs; and which we tranſmit to you in this letter.

"In reality, who is there that does not know what the Roman Church, the mother and miſtreſs of all others, preaches, teaches, and commands, on the duty of obedience from ſubjects to earthly powers?

"At the very commencement of the yet infant Church, bleſſed Peter, Prince of the Apoſtles, inſtructing the faithful, exhorted them in theſe words:—*Be ye ſubject to every human creature for God's ſake, whether it be to the king as excelling, or to governors as ſent by him, for the puniſhment of evil doers, and for the praiſe of the good; for ſo is the will of God, that by doing well you may ſilence the ignorance of fooliſh men.* The Catholic Church being directed by theſe precepts, the moſt renowned champions of

*No one word in the Engliſh language correſponds exactly with PERSEQUAR, as uſed here. Abſtractedly it certainly cannot be conſidered as ſignifying PERSECUTION. To make it bear this conſtruction, it muſt be united with ſome word of hoſtile meaning, as *Perſequi bello, gladio, &c.* — one may even ſay *perſequi beneficio*:—at any rate it is juſt to admit that conſtruction which the See of Rome itſelf NOW gives it—it matters not whether it were ever differently conſtrued. (Vide *Ainſworth's Dictionary.*)

of the Chriſtian name replied to the Gentiles when raging againſt them, as enemies of the empire, with furious hatred; *we are conſtantly praying*, (Tertullian in Apologet. chap. xxx.) *that all the emperors may enjoy long life, quiet government, a loyal houſehold, a brave army, a faithful ſenate, an honeſt people and general tranquility.* The Biſhops of Rome, ſucceſſors of Peter, have not ceaſed to inculcate this doctrine, eſpecially to miſſionaries, leſt any ill-will ſhould be excited againſt the profeſſors of the catholic faith, in the minds of thoſe who are enemies of the Chriſtian name. We paſs over the illuſtrious proofs of this fact preſerved in the records of ancient Roman Pontiffs; of which yourſelves are not ignorant. We think proper, notwithſtanding, to remind you of a late admonition of the moſt wiſe Pope Benedict XIV. who in his regulations for the Engliſh miſſions, which are likewiſe applicable to you, ſpeaks thus:—*The Vicars Apoſtolic are to take diligent care that the miſſionaries behave on all occaſions with integrity and decorum, and thus become good models to others; and particularly that they be always ready to celebrate the ſacred offices, to communicate proper inſtructions to the people, and to comfort the ſick with their aſſiſtance; that they by all means avoid public aſſemblies of idle men, and taverns. . . . . The Vicars themſelves are particularly charged to puniſh in ſuch manner as they can, but ſeverely all thoſe who do not ſpeak of the public government with reſpect.*"

"England herſelf can witneſs the deep-rooted impreſſions ſuch admonitions have made on the minds of Catholics. It is well known, that in the late war, which had extended to the greater part of America, when moſt flouriſhing provinces, inhabited, almoſt by perſons ſeparated from the Catholic Church, had renounced the government of the King of Great-Britain; the province of Canada alone, filled as it is almoſt with innumerable Catholics, although artfully tempted, and not yet forgetful of the old French government, remained moſt faithful in its allegiance to England. Do you, moſt excellent Prelates, converſe frequently on theſe principles:

often

often remind your ſuffragan Prelates of them: when preaching to your people, exhort them again and again *to honour all men, to love the brotherhood, to fear God, to honour the king.*

"Thoſe duties of a Chriſtian are to be cheriſhed in every kingdom and ſtate, but particularly in your own of Great-Britain and Ireland, where, from the benevolence of a moſt wiſe King, and other moſt excellent rulers of thoſe kingdoms towards Catholics, no cruel and grievous burden is impoſed: and Catholics themſelves experience a mild and gentle government. If you purſue this line of conduct unanimouſly; if you act in the ſpirit of charity; if, while you direct the people of the Lord you have nothing in view but the ſalvation of ſouls, adverſaries will be aſhamed (we repeat it) to calumniate, and will freely acknowledge that the Catholic Faith is of heavenly deſcent, and calculated not only to procure a bleſſed life, but likewiſe, as St. Auguſtin obſerves in his 138th letter, addreſſed to Marcellinus, to promote the moſt laſting peace of this earthly city, inaſmuch as it is the ſafeſt prop and ſhield of kingdoms. *Let thoſe who ſay* (the words are thoſe of the holy Doctor) *that the doctrine of Chriſt is hoſtile to the Republic, produce an army of ſuch ſoldiers as the doctrine of Chriſt has required; let them furniſh ſuch inhabitants of provinces, ſuch huſbands, ſuch wives, ſuch parents, ſuch children, ſuch maſters, ſuch ſervants, ſuch kings, ſuch judges, finally ſuch payers of debts and collectors of the revenue, as the doctrine of Chriſt enjoins; and then they may dare to aſſert that it is inimical to the republic: rather let them not heſitate to acknowledge, that it is, when practiſed, of great advantage to the republic.* The ſame holy Doctor, and all the other Fathers of the Church, with one voice, moſt clearly demonſtrate by invincible arguments, that the whole of this ſalutary doctrine cannot exiſt with permanent conſiſtency and ſtability; or flouriſh except in the catholic ſociety; which is ſpread and preſerved all over the world by communion with the See of Rome as a ſacred bond of union, divinely connecting both. From our very high eſteem

and

and affection for you, we earneſtly wiſh that the great God may very long preſerve you ſafe. Farewell.

Rome, 23 *June*. 1791.

As your Lordſhip's moſt affectionate brother,

L. CARDINAL ANTONELLI, Prefect.

A. ARCHBISHOP OF ADEN, Secretary."

Sir J. C. HIPPISLEY's Remark.

"I have here recited an extract of conſiderable length, from this document, becauſe the Honourable Member has himſelf alluded to a part of it, where he obſerves an alteration of the Pontifical Oath made at the inſtance of the Empreſs of Ruſſia. I could wiſh a reference may be made to the original Latin, which will be found in Dr. Troy's work; from which this tranſlation is alſo ſelected — The Pontifical Reſcript for the alteration of the Pontifical Oath to be taken by the Iriſh Catholic Prelates is as follows:—

"FROM AN AUDIENCE HAD OF HIS HOLINESS ON THE 9TH DAY OF JUNE, 1791.*

"The Archbiſhops metropolitans of the kingdom of Ireland repreſented to his Holineſs, that from the ignorance or malice of ſome perſons, certain expreſſions in the form of the Oath, preſcribed by the Roman Ritual to be taken by Biſhops at their conſecration, and by Archbiſhops on receiving the *Pall*, have been miſrepreſented; which has added new perplexities to thoſe which they daily experience in a kingdom where the catholic faith is not the religion of the ſtate: wherefore they humbly requeſted, if it ſhould appear expedient to his Holineſs, that he would vouchſafe to apply a remedy by ſome act of his apoſtolical vigilance. His Holineſs, on this report being made to him by me the underwritten, all circumſtances

* Vide Dr. Troy's Paſtoral Addreſs, 1793.

cumſtances of the caſe maturely conſidered, was graciouſly pleaſed to grant, that the Biſhops of the kingdom of Ireland, at their conſecration, and the Archbiſhops on receiving the *Pall*, may uſe the ſame form of oath, which was taken by the Archbiſhop of *Mohilow**, in the empire of the Muſcovites, by permiſſion of his ſaid Holineſs, and which is as follows :

I *N. N* &c. (as in the Roman Pontifical to the clauſe—*All Heretics, Schiſmatics, and Rebels, againſt our ſaid Lord, and his ſucceſſors aforeſaid, I will to the utmoſt of my power, proſecute and oppoſe*†——which is entirely omitted:) afterwards the words —*the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for propagating the Faith*, are ſubſtituted inſtead of *the Cardinal Proponent in the Congregation of the Sacred Council.* The form concludes with theſe words : *I will obſerve all and every one of theſe things the more inviolably, as I am firmly convinced that there is nothing contained in them, which can be contrary to the fidelity I owe to the moſt ſerene King of Great-Britain and Ireland, and to his ſucceſſors to the throne. So help me God and theſe holy Goſpels of God. Thus I promiſe, and engage.*

Dated at Rome, in the houſe of the ſaid Sacred Congregation the 23d Day of June, 1791.

L. Cardinal Antonelli, Prefect.

A. Archbishop Adanen, Secretary."

Sir J. C. Hippisley's Remark.

The learned Member will obſerve that his conſtruction of the words " *Hæreticos perſequar et impugnabo*," is very widely at variance with that which is inculcated by Rome herſelf.——I ſhould not have been ſatisfied that the popular ſenſe imputed to thoſe words, was diſclaimed by the Catholics of this kingdom, if the See of Rome had held the contrary; but I muſt own that I am, in this

* Mohilow was erected into an archbiſhopric, with a chapter, by the Pope Pius VI. The firſt Archbiſhop *Staniſlaus Sieſtrzencewez*, was appointed in a conſiſtory at Rome, 21ſt December, 1783, and is ſtill living.

† Biſhop of Cloyne's tranſlation.

this inſtance, perfectly ſatisfied with the declaration of Rome itſelf, as I read it, thus ſolemnly made, and as I know from the moſt authentic collateral authorities, that notwithſtanding the perſecuting ſpirit avowed by ſome individual writers, and manifeſted alſo by ſome individual Pontiffs, that ſuch a ſpirit is not conſiſtent with the recogniſed doctrines of the See of Rome."

Though all ſuppoſitions againſt the declarations of the Roman Pontiff and the catholic univerſities are vain, the writer offers an argument of more impoſing authority, capable of reducing to ſilence, a man ſteeled againſt conviction, if deep rooted prejudice, combined with intereſt, could be ſilent, that is, the Catholics of the United Kingdom, rather than take an oath, inconſiſtent with the principles which they profeſs, have during the ſpace of one hundred years ſubmitted to all the penalties and diſabilities of a ſyſtem of penal laws, the moſt inſulting and oppreſſive that human imagination has yet ſuggeſted; laws, which that celebrated Stateſman Edmund Burke called *ferocious*; laws of which the Catholics of Ireland in their petition to Parliament for a mitigation ſay: "for near one hundred years we, our fathers and grandfathers have groaned under a code of laws (in ſome parts already purged from the ſtatutes) the like of which, no age, no nation, no climate ever ſaw."—See Parnell, p. 134.

In the ſame petition they ſay: "with regard to our civil principles, we are unalterably, deeply and zealouſly, attached to his Majeſty's perſon and government .... with regard to the conſtitution of the Church, we are, indeed, inviolably attached to our own, firſt, becauſe we believe it to be true; and next becauſe, beyond belief, we know that its principles are calculated to make us, and have made us, good men and good citizens"—*ibidem.*

Never was teſtimony more public, more authentic, more honorable! The teſtimony of four millions! The teſtimony of men incapable of compromiſing with conſcience!

ſcience! The teſtimony of men, who knew the principles of their religion, who believed them true, and who beyond belief, knew them to be ſound and good! If they had been as condeſcending as Charas, whoſe complaiſance in profeſſing a faith, which he did not believe true, in compliance with the injunctions of the Inquiſition, this caſtigator laments they would, like him, have ſilenced conſcience, and by an oath have freed themſelves from all diſabilities. It is therefore manifeſt as the ſun at mid-day that what they diſclaim they do not believe.

Before the writer proceeds to diſcuſs the Edinburgh caſtigator's efforts to perplex the truth of the perpetual viſibility of Chriſt's church, and his artful endeavours to involve in obſcurity a truth, which extorts the aſſent of the unbiaſſed underſtanding, he finds it neceſſary to inform the unprejudiced reader that there is no article of doctrine, ſo univerſally miſunderſtood by diſſenters of different deſcriptions as the pope's primacy or ſupremacy as it is called. It is almoſt invariably miſrepreſented, ſome through ignorance, others through artifice, many through a deeply rooted prejudice, which aſſumes the appearance, if not the reality of the moſt virulent rancour, ſtate it entirely different from what it is in reality, they perſuade themſelves that this hideous form, which it takes in their cancered imagination, is ſomething real; hence theſe furious declamations and ſenſeleſs invectives againſt all popes indiſcriminately. If in the annals of ages it appears, that at any time, or in any country, the pope's injunctions were not implicitly obeyed, though in a thouſand inſtances it appears that his primacy was univerſally acknowledged, this ſolitary inſtance of non compliance is ſeized with avidity, as if ſufficient to confound a truth, which the hiſtory of all Churches, and the unanimous conſent of Chriſtians atteſt. If theſe men would ſilence prejudice, and on a ſubject ſo intereſting to the peace of the Chriſtian Church, taking reaſon for their guide, conſult hiſtory with

with a view to truth, they would find this non-compliance with the pope's injunctions, did not proceed from any oppoſition to his primacy, of which there was not the ſhadow of a doubt, but from an idea of his interference on that particular occaſion being an infringement of the rights of patriarchs, of metropolitans, or national ſynods, which were ſecured to them by eccleſiaſtical rules and canons, theſe rights the popes themſelves poſſeſſed and exerciſed within certain limits; but if on any occaſion they extended theſe rights beyond their limits they were ſure of meeting oppoſition; hence we find that Cyprian conſidering the queſtion of rebaptiſation as a matter of eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, over which the African prelates in their national ſynods exerciſed an uncontrouled juriſdiction, refuſed to accede to Stephen's deciſion, and reſiſted even his threats, becauſe he thought it an encroachment on the rights of the national church of Africa, though no man had a more profound reſpect for the Apoſtolical See of Rome, as every man muſt ſee who reads his works. He calls it the *See of Peter*, *the principal Church*, *the ſource of ſacerdotal unity*, &c. In like manner the Aſiatic biſhops, with *Polycrates*, of Epheſus, at their head, conſidering the celebration of Eaſter on any particular day, as a matter of mere eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, within the juriſdiction of their national ſynod, notwithſtanding the remonſtrances of pope Victor, and his threats of excommunication for diſobedience, perſiſted in celebrating the Eaſter on the 14th day of the moon with the Jews, yet that theſe prelates never doubted the primacy of the pope is clear from the letter written by Polycrates in their name and addreſſed to that pontiff. "We celebrate the Eaſter inviolably," ſays Polycrates, "without adding or diminiſhing;" he then enumerates many holy biſhops and martyrs who celebrated the Eaſter in the ſame manner, amongſt them he names St. John, the evangeliſt, and St. Philip, an apoſtle, with his two daughters *nuns*, or, as he calls them, *virgins*, [it ſeems this nonſenſical inſtitution, which the caſtigator hates, was authoriſed by the

apoſtles] following their example he was not alarmed at the pope's menace: "for me," ſays he, "who have lived ſixty-five years in the Lord, who have communicated with all the brethren in the world, who have read the whole ſcripture, I am not troubled at what is propoſed to terrify us: I know that they, who were greater than I, ſaid it is more neceſſary to obey God than men." "I might," continues Polycrates, "name the biſhops who are preſent, whom I aſſembled at your requeſt, if I named them you would ſee their great multitude, and knowing my littleneſs they have all notwithſtanding approved my letter,"—Euſ. L. v, cap. 24. Is not this the language of a man, who writes to his ſuperior? Who aſſigns the reaſons why he does not comply with his injunctions? It is remarkable that, in theſe diſputes, Stephen and Victor were correct, and their deciſions were founded; Cyprian and Polycrates were deceived, and their oppoſition productive of bad conſequences, as is invariably the caſe when lawful authority is reſiſted.

The declaration of the French Clergy affords irreſiſtible evidence that oppoſition to the pope's interference on certain occaſions may be without prejudice of his ſupremacy. In the third article of that declaration they ſay: "*the exerciſe of the Eccleſiaſtical Power is to be regulated by the canons.*" Theſe articles have been ſtrenuouſly ſupported by Boſſuet in his *defence of the declaration* of the French Clergy; yet no man ever ſuſpected Boſſuet of being diſaffected to the papal ſupremacy in its true ſenſe: few men have demonſtrated with more force or efficacy the divine original of this ſupremacy, and its indiſpenſable neceſſity for the ſupport of order, unanimity and union in the Chriſtian church. It is almoſt an intuitive truth that without one ſuperintending power there can be no union or unanimity: if biſhops were all independent we ſhould have as many ſects and ſchiſms as there are biſhops of diſcordant views; and the Chriſtian church would reſemble thoſe jarring ſects, which are divided and ſubdivided into as many ſeparate ſocieties as there

there are leaders, who lend their opinions, and form parties, there being no general ſuperintendant, in whom the authority of the whole is concentrated, and who in the exerciſe of that authority, to ſilence clamours, to prevent diſſentions and diſputes, and to confine the reſtleſs and turbulent within due bounds, is ſupported by the whole. This is a truth ſo irreſiſtible that the moſt learned proteſtants admit it. Melancthon, who firſt aſſumed the name, in his anſwer to Billicanius ſays; "we agree that the government of biſhops in different churches and the *Preſidency of the Biſhop of Rome* over them is a legal form: for the pope's ſupremacy would tend much to preſerve amongſt different nations the unity of doctrine, ſo that were other points agreed on the popes ſupremacy might be eaſily allowed." And, Grotius, a man celebrated in the republic of letters, in his diſcuſſion of Rivett's Apology, gives it as his opinion, that Proteſtants will never be united with each other, until they are ſo with thoſe, who adhere to the See of Rome, without which he ſays no common agreement or government can be expected.

The ancients had a juſt notion both of the papal and patriarchal authority, the patriarchal as well as the metropolitan juriſdiction they knew to be of eccleſiaſtical right, eſtabliſhed either by immemorial cuſtom, as was that of Alexandria and Antioch, or by decrees of General Councils as was that of Conſtantinople. That they thought the patriarchal juriſdiction variable, the hiſtory of this latter See affords ample proof: it was originally ſuffragan to Heraclea; in complaiſance to the emperor, who had fixed his chief reſidence in that city, it was elevated to the rank of metropolitan; in the ſecond Council of Conſtantinople, at which none of the Weſtern prelates aſſiſted, the biſhop of that city obtained the prerogative of honour after the biſhop of Rome, becauſe, ſaid the prelates, Conſtantinople is *a New Rome*—Canon iii. He thus obtained a precedence over the ancient patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch; and, finally in the Council

of

of Chalcedon, Anatolius, the then biſhop, an artful and intriguing prelate, by the influence of the Court, obtained a confirmation of this rank of precedence after the biſhop of Rome together with an extenſive juriſdiction, and ſimilar privileges within his new juriſdiction to theſe which the Roman pontiff exerciſed within the patriarchate of Rome. The twenty-eighth canon is thus conceived: "the Fathers had reaſon to grant to the See of old Rome its privileges, becauſe it was the ruling city, and through the ſame motive the 150 Fathers have judged that the new Rome (Con.) which is honored with the empire and the ſenate ſhould have the ſame advantages in the eccleſiaſtical order and be the ſecond after it." The Fathers then ſpecify the privileges which they confer on the See of Conſtantinople: "ſo that," continues the canon, "the metropolitans of the diſtricts of Pontus, of Thrace, and of Aſia only, and the biſhops of theſe dioceſes, which are amongſt the Barbarians be ordained by the See of Conſtantinople. It is well underſtood that each metropolitan of theſe diſtricts will ordain the biſhops of his Province with his comprovincial biſhops according to the canons" Though this canon did not abridge in any ſenſe the pope's ſovereign juriſdiction, nor interfere at all with his authority as chief paſtor of the church, yet Leo the Great quaſhed the canon for two reaſons: firſt, becauſe it falſely aſſerted that privileges were granted by the Fathers to the Roman See becauſe it was the imperial city, which was a manifeſt falſehood: for the authority of the Roman pontiff as chief paſtor of the church was derived from St. Peter, and was of divine inſtitution; and the privileges, which he exerciſed as Patriarch of the Weſt were founded on immemorial cuſtom, as were thoſe of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch; and ſecondly, becauſe it authoriſed an uſurpation of the ancient rights of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, which had been confirmed to them by the Council of Nice, in the 4th canon, of which this canon of Chalcedon

don was a notorious infraction. If the juriſdiction of the See of Rome had been of eccleſiaſtical right or inſtitution, nothing could prevent Anatolius, ſupported by the whole weight of the Imperial Court, from obtaining for his See of Conſtantinople, a rank of precedence before that See, as he did before the Sees of Alexandria and Antioch. The juriſdiction which Anatolius obtained in the diſtricts ſpecified in the canon did not abridge the pope's patriarchal juriſdiction: it never extended to them diſtricts; nor did he at any time interfere with the rights of the Eaſtern patriarchs in ſuperintending the elections, and canonical inſtitutions of the prelates ſubject to their Sees; or in other points of church diſcipline, over which they exerciſed their patriarchal juriſdiction controled by the canons alone, the obſervance of which was enforced by the pope's authority as ſucceſſor to Peter, and chief paſtor of Chriſt's flock. Hence Gregory the Great, in the letter to Eulogius, injudiciouſly cited by the caſtigator, ſays: "nothing can redound to my honour, which conduces to the diſhonour of my brethren: I place my honour in maintaining them in theirs." And, in a letter to John, biſhop of Syracuſe, ſpeaking of the biſhop of Conſtantinople, who had aſſumed the title of *univerſal biſhop*, as if he were the only biſhop, and all other prelates his vicars, Gregory ſays: "as to his ſaying that he is ſubject to the Apoſtolical See, if any fault be found in biſhops, I do not know what biſhop is not ſubject to it; but if no fault require its interference, they are all equal according to the rule of humility."—L. vii. Ep. 65. Fleury, who never miſſed an opportunity of depreſſing papal authority, remarks on this paſſage: "theſe words of St. Gregory indicate in a preciſe manner, the limits of the power of the Head of the Church: as long as biſhops do their duty, he treats them as his equals, but he is the ſuperior of them all when there is a queſtion of correction."—L. xxxv.

After diſcharging a certain portion of fœtid bile, with which this Edinburgh caſtigator ſeems to be greatly over-

over-charged, in denouncing maledictions againſt the *Beaſt of Babylon*, and foretelling the *eternal diſſolution* of the Romiſh Church immediately impending, whether to fill his pamphlet, or to ſurpriſe the good wives with his great erudition, he gives us all the notes of the catholic church, as taken from Bellarmine. Quere—Has he ever read a line in the works of that controvertiſt? Does he rightly underſtand the language in which they are written! Would he condeſcend to oblige us with a refutation of Bellarmine's reaſoning on the ſubject? *Hic Labor, hoc opus.* He has done it in a ſummary way—by ſaying nothing. Paſſing from Bellarmine, he recites this paſſage from the writer's remarks: "He, the writer, does not enquire whether the Church of Chriſt be the Roman Church or the Engliſh Church, or a Church of any other denomination: ſuch an enquiry is uſeleſs: for if it be incontrovertibly true, that the Church of Chriſt is and was perpetually viſible ſince the publication of the new law on the day of Pentecoſt; all the different ſocieties, which have ſince been formed, all the churches whoſe commencement is fixed by catholics to a later date, and admitted by the members of theſe churches to have commenced at that time, in their preſent form, are manifeſtly no parts nor portions of the one Church of Chriſt, at all times, and without ceſſation viſible." To this he replies, that no proteſtant church, which proceeds on ſcriptural principles, acknowledges a commencement at a later date than the days of the apoſtles," p. 151. His ſpirit of divination forgot to remind him that the firſt Proteſtant Church, of which the world knows any thing, acknowledged it, if we may believe Luther himſelf and his panegyriſts. This patriarch of reforming memory ſays that in his firſt eſſay, and to do him juſtice, it was a maſter-piece, "he was all alone," "*primo ſolus eram.*" "I alone," ſays he, "rolled the ſtone.—Tom. ii. Fol. 63. I was alone in danger, forſaken by all, *aſſiſted by none.*" This firſt proteſtant church commenced in him, and not before him; for he had not one aſſiſtant. His teſtimo-

ny,

ny, however ſtrong, is confirmed by his ableſt panegyriſts. Doctor Tillotſon, in his 49th ſermon, ſays: "in the beginning of the reformation, when popery had overrun theſe weſtern parts, and ſubdued her enemies *on every ſide*, and Antichriſt (the Pope) ſat ſecurely in the quiet poſſeſſion of his Kingdom, Luther aroſe, a bold, rough man, but a fit wedge to cleave aſunder ſo hard and knotty a block, appearing ſtoutly againſt the groſs errors of the Church of Rome, *and for a long time ſtood alone.*" And Jewell aſſures us, that "The truth was unknown at the time, *and unheard of*, when Martin Luther firſt came to the knowledge of the goſpel"—Ap. B. iv. Ch. 4. And Perkins, the celebrated Profeſſor of Cambridge goes further, he ſays: that "Before Luther, for many hundreds of years ſuch an univerſal apoſtacy overſpread the whole world, that the *Proteſtant Church was not viſible any where*," Per. on the Creed, p. 400. As a church of any kind, whether true or falſe, is, and muſt of all neceſſity be, compoſed of men, women and children, by whatever bond they are united; at leaſt in this ſublunary world of ours there is no inviſible church: for there are no inviſible men, women or children to compoſe it. The man who reſiſts this truth is not ſound in head, or he is horribly depraved in heart. It is therefore irreſiſtibly true that the firſt proteſtant church commenced in Luther, and, if we believe his greateſt admirers and moſt zealous diſciples, on whom a double portion of his ſpirit deſcended, the century writers of Magdeburgh, to whoſe reſearches our Edinburgh caſtigator is indebted for all theſe garbled extracts with which he has filled a volume, it ended with him: for they ſay in their preface to the ſecond century: "the greateſt variations in doctrine and changes ſeem to impend; thus the ſins of men deſerve, which are growing every day more atrocious, (Eraſmus thought ſo too) the times of the Germanic prophet Martin Luther, by whoſe voice and miniſtry the light of the goſpel *was recalled*, as if from the Egyptian darkneſs, almoſt correſponded with the age of the Apoſtles;

tles ; but now ſince his death, we have entered as it were into another age of the goſpel, in which ſo many religious frenzies, *fanaticiſme*, begin to ſpring up and gradually to reign :" and in their preface to the 5th Cen. after lamenting that many of Luther's doctrines were already forgotten, they ſay : " the truth that was brought to view has *already periſhed*, and that ſuddenly : philoſophy, popery, and other ſects, far and wide, occupy the firſt chair in the temple of God." We have it then from Luther and his friends, that the firſt proteſtant church commenced in him ; he was the foundation ſtone on which the edifice was raiſed, *and he ſtood a long time alone* ; and we have it from his diſciples that it ended with him : the foundation was rotten, and the ſuperſtructure tumbled into ruins, *and that ſuddenly they ſay*, " *et id repente.*" Calvin, the boaſted father of another grand diviſion of the reformed churches, ſays, that his diviſion began with himſelf : " we have been forced," ſays he, Ep. 14° " to renounce the communion of the whole world." This has been invariably and univerſally acknowledged by proteſtants of every deſcription. Chillingworth aſſigns the reaſon, " becauſe," ſays he, " *Safe Way,*" Ch. v. " they were convinced by all manner of evidence, as ſcripture, reaſon, and antiquity, that all the *viſible churches in the world* had degenerated from the purity of the goſpel." We muſt, then, conclude that theſe firſt proteſtant churches did not act on ſcriptural principles ; does this laſt church, faſhioned by our Edinburgh caſtigator ? We maintain, ſays he, that we have only re-aſſumed our original form, after having been *transformed into the image of the Beaſt.* This his new Church, therefore, had been, during a lapſe of centuries, *in the image of the beaſt*, and then reſumed its original form. To this the writer replies, that if this fancied exiſtence of a Church in the image of the Beaſt had been real, it was not the church of Chriſt, nor any portion or integrant part of the church of Chriſt : for Chriſt is head of his Church ; he teaches his church by the miniſtry of his apoſtles,

apoſtles, and their ſucceſſors, and it is animated by his ſpirit : to pretend that Chriſt is head of a church in the image of the beaſt is the moſt atrocious blaſphemy. Hence it follows that beſides this church in the image of the beaſt, on which this caſtigator's diſordered brain has beſtowed an imaginary exiſtence, there muſt have been ſome other church, of which Chriſt is, and was the head, if it be true that his church was perpetually viſible. He has not deigned to tell us in what form the proteſtant churches exiſted in the apoſtles' days ; or when they ceaſed to exiſt in that form and were transformed into the image of the beaſt. Theſe are abſtruſe queſtions. The truth is, we do not know in what form they exiſt on this preſent day : we know they are numerous, unconnected, diſcordant in their principles of faith, and church diſcipline, agreeing in nothing but their diſagreement and oppoſition to what they call popery ; we know from better authority than this caſtigator, that in the apoſtles days there was but one church profeſſing the ſame faith " *una fides*," *one faith*, participating the ſame ſacraments : " *unum baptiſma*" one baptiſm.—Eph. iv. United under the ſame chief paſtor *Peter*, who was commiſſioned by Chriſt to feed his flock. —John xxi. We know that this one church was a viſible ſociety compoſed not of ſouls or angels, or other inviſible beings, but of mortals like ourſelves, ſo perfectly united in the profeſſion of the ſame faith, participation of the ſame ſacraments, and obedience to the ſame chief paſtor, that the apoſtle Paul, ſays : it was *one body* " *unum corpus*" animated with one and the ſame ſpirit—" *unus ſpiritus.*" Eph. iv. Does this caſtigator pretend that the numerous, or rather innumerable churches, which call themſelves proteſtant, are ſo perfectly united as to form one compact body, animated by one and the ſame ſpirit ? If ſo, why theſe diſputes, diſſentions and variations in doctrine, which commenced with the reformation and are every day increaſing ? If not, the proteſtant churches have not re-aſſumed the form of the church in the apoſtles days.

But perhaps the caſtigator, confines the re-aſſumption of the form of the apoſtolical church to that particular proteſtant church, of which he is himſelf chief paſtor. There are many, who pretend an equal right, and with equal juſtice, all theſe he muſt exclude on the principle of ſelf defence, and at the ſame time he excludes himſelf from the promiſes of Abraham, and from the inheritance promiſed to that patriarch, who is, if we believe St. Paul, the father of all, who believe in Jeſus Chriſt, Rom. iv. 16. " In thy ſeed ſhall all the nations of the earth be bleſſed," Gen. xxvi, 4. St. Paul ſays, that this promiſe was made to Jeſus Chriſt, that in him and by him all nations of the earth ſhould be bleſſed.—Gal. iii, 16. The church of Jeſus Chriſt is therefore, the church of all nations and of all ages, for no reaſon can be aſſigned why it ſhould be confined to one age in preference to others, more particularly as the angel Gabriel, announcing his incarnation ſaid, " Of his kingdom there will be no end."—Luke i, 33. The church of this reverend and caſtigating paſtor, is ſo far from being the church of all nations, that it is not the church of any nation at all, and it is ſo very far from being the church of all ages, that he himſelf ſays, it was the image of the Beaſt for many ages. The moſt idle conceit, and ridiculous ſubterfuge which the writer remembers to have ſeen. In its preſent form, it is as oppoſite to the church founded by the apoſtles as darkneſs is to light : for in the apoſtolical church the paſtors were conſtituted by Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, the great ſhepherd, as St. Paul called him.—Heb. xiii, 20. Immediately, as the apoſtle Peter and his fellow apoſtles, or mediately by their miniſtry as Paul and Barnaby.—Acts xiii, 2..... As they were miniſtering to the Lord and *faſting* " *nēſteuontēn.*" The Holy Ghoſt ſaid: ſegregate for me Barnaby and Paul, for the work, to which I have called them ; then *faſting* and praying, and impoſing hands on them, they diſmiſſed them " (this *nonſenſical rite faſting*, which the caſtigator hates, was in uſe in the apoſtolical church,) and ſo on in ſucceſſion as

Timothy

Timothy and Titus ordained by Paul.—1 Tim. iv, 14. "Do not neglect the grace which is in you, which was given to you by prophesy with the *imposition* of hands of the priesthood," and 2d Tim. i. 6. "For which reason I remind you to rekindle the grace of God which is in you, by the imposition of my hands." This imposition of hands, which we catholics call the sacrament of orders, conferred a permanent grace: for the apostle says: "It was in him from the time that he had conferred the priesthood on him, by the imposition of his hands, and this same grace was conferred on others by the apostles' disciples"—Titus i, v. "For this reason I left you in Crete, that you might correct defects, and constitute Priests in each city, according to the orders which I have given you." In this new modelled Church over which this castigator presides, Christ does not constitute pastors, either immediately by himself, or mediately by the ministry of his apostles, or their successors in office; but the people elect, constitute and appoint their pastors according to their own views, literally verifying that prophecy of St. Paul, 2d Tim. iv, 3: "There will be a time when they will not bear sound doctrine, but, according to their sensual desires, they will collect teachers for themselves, with itching ears." This is the first, and a striking difference it is, between this new modelled church, and the Church of Christ in the apostles' days; the second is not less remarkable: in the apostolical church there was but one faith—"*una fides*"—Eph. iv, and that one faith delivered to the faithful by their pastors: "The faith once delivered to the saints"—Jude 3. "Have the form of sound words, *which you heard from me* in faith and charity, which is in Christ Jesus"—2d Tim. i, 13. In the next chapter the apostle says to Timothy: "These things which you have heard from me, with many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who will be capable of teaching others"—ii, 2. In this new-modelled church there are as many faiths as faces, or fancies—to speak correctly there is no faith at all, but as many opinions as there

there are individuals capable of forming an opinion. This is a direct and inevitable consequence of that fundamental principle, that every man must take the scriptures for a sole rule of faith; he must therefore on principle fish his faith from the scriptures by his own industry, in other words, he must form his opinions, independently, on that sense of the scripture, which presents itself to his view. This is neither less nor more than his private opinion, the man is destitute of common sense who denies it. To pass unnoticed an intuitive truth, that a great majority of protestants are incapable of deducing any opinion at all from the scriptures, and must, contrary to principle, borrow from their teachers, or from others who chuse to lend them; of these, it is true that they have neither faith nor opinion; it is, therefore, manifestly true, that this new modelled Church has not re-assumed the form of the apostolical church; and if it be true, as the castigator says, and this the writer is willing to admit, that it was in the image of the Beast, it yet continues in the image of the Beast.

The form, say philosophers, is that which limits the matter, and distinguishes the subject of which it is the form: hence the form of the apostolical church consists in these characteristics, which limit that society called the church, and distinguish it from every other society. These have been defined by the inspired writers with great precision: they professed one and the same faith received from pastors instituted by Christ himself, either immediately, or mediately by their ministry; they participated in the same sacraments; they were united as one body, animated with the same spirit under the same visible head, Eph. iv. nourished by one and the same spiritual food: "*ôti êis artos én soma ói polloi esmen ói gar pantes ek tou énos artou metechomen.* So there is one bread, *(the eucharist)* we who are many, *one body*: for we all partake of this one bread."—1st Cor. x, 17. Of these characteristics not one is to be found in this newest modelled church of the Edinburgh castigator, as the writer has already shewn.

After

After having, with unuſual confidence, aſſerted that this his neweſt modelled church had re-aſſumed its original *form*, an expreſſion, which he does not underſtand, without offering a ſyllable in juſtification of the aſſertion, "but as *we maintain*," the caſtigator ſays, "the church of Rome is an anti-chriſtian church, becauſe it has not ſubſiſted in its preſent form ſince the apoſtles' days." This he pretends to prove, not by argument, but by a rhapſodical enumeration of popes, cardinals, archbiſhops, and monks of different orders, which enable him to fill a page. If the man knew the force of the term *form*, or if he knew any thing of the characteriſtics, which conſtitute the form of a church, he would not be tempted even by vanity, to expoſe his ignorance to ſuch contempt: is it not aſtoniſhing that a man, who knows nothing of the art of reaſoning, ſhould preſume to write on a ſubject of deep reſearch, with which he is totally unacquainted. He might with equal propriety, rather with not leſs abſurdity, pretend that the form of a kingdom is changed by the eſtabliſhment of different corporations, which have bye laws for the regulation of their own ſocieties; but he is told that theſe ſocieties of civil inſtitution, however different their relative duties, have nothing to do with the form of the kingdom; in like manner he is told, that theſe different ranks and orders of eccleſiaſtical inſtitution, have nothing to do with the form of the church. They all profeſs the ſame faith; they participate the ſame ſacraments, and are united under the ſame viſible head, Peter's ſucceſſor, as the primitive chriſtians were under Peter himſelf. His invectives reach the apoſtles themſelves: for they had renounced every thing in this world to follow Chriſt, if we believe Peter.—Matt. xix. *Ecce nos reliquimus omnia*, and their immediate diſciples followed the example.—Acts iv. That the voluntary poverty, obedience, and chaſtity, promiſed by all the religous orders, have been recommended, though not ſtrictly enjoined, by Chriſt himſelf has been ſhewn to demonſtration—ſee Review,

p.

p. 156 - . . . . . The obſervance of theſe virtues, if we believe the caſtigator, has depopulated the earth. The Saviour has therefore injudiciouſly recommended them. The caſtigator's invectives are not confined to the apoſtles; the Saviour comes in for a ſhare. What a ſtrange antipathy he repeatedly expreſſes againſt that antiquated virtue called chaſtity. There are, if common fame tell truth, as many daughters of diſſipation in London and Edinburgh, as there are nuns in Vienna, Rome, Paris, Madrid, Naples, and the other capitals of all the catholic ſtates in Europe. In theſe capitals there are daughters of diſſipation too, yes, and many; but they do not alarm this caſtigating paſtor's humanity; his invectives do not extend to them: they do not depopulate the world; they are piouſly engaged in what he calls the paſtor's firſt great duty, that is, the propagation of the human ſpecies. Raynal thought ſo too, and ſo does that foul fiend who wanders in the unwatered places ſeeking reſt and finding none.—Matt. xii. 43.

In his next chapter, he pretends to examine the indefectibility of the church, that is the perpetual and uninterrupted exiſtence which it has always enjoyed, and will continue to poſſeſs till the end of time. Of this doctrine, he ſays, p. 130, proteſtants are as ſtrenuous ſupporters as the Romiſh church, but they will not admit the conſequence which the writer has deduced. The caſtigator, is not the firſt whom irreſiſtible evidence has forced to ſhift his ground; but his evil genius has led him to a poſition the moſt unlucky, that ever entered man's imagination, that is, to *the image of the beaſt*, this is his laſt refuge, in it he makes a ſtand. The conſequence which the writer deduced, and which he now repeats, is—that if it be true, and true it is, if the ſcriptures be not falſe, that the church has always exiſted, and will continue to exiſt, until the end of time, it muſt always exiſt in the ſame *form*: for it is the form which limits, which defines, which conſtitutes and diſtinguiſhes; if then the form ceaſes to exiſt, the church muſt of all

neceſſity

neceſſity ceaſe to exiſt: for no body can exiſt, whether natural or moral, without its conſtituent attributes; thus, for inſtance, if the materials which compoſe a ſhip be employed in the conſtruction of a houſe, the materials continue to exiſt, but not the ſhip; or if a State changes its form of Government, and from a monarchy becomes a republic, it is not the monarchy which continues to exiſt under a republican form: for the one form excludes the other, but the monarchy has ceaſed to exiſt, and the republic has ſucceeded it; in like manner if the church ſhould change its original form, and aſſume the form of the Beaſt; it is not the church which would continue to exiſt under the form of the Beaſt; but the church would have abſolutely ceaſed to exiſt, and the ſynagogue of Satan would have ſucceeded, in which this Edinburgh caſtigator has, with great truth and propriety, found his new modelled church.

Admitting that the many paſſages adduced by the writer in his remarks, p. 110..... in ſupport of the uninterrupted exiſtence of the church, are of irreſiſtible authority, the caſtigator ſelects one, which by the bye was incidental, though not leſs mortifying to the ſpirit of innovation; on it he declaims with great vehemence: It is thus conceived and expreſſed by the prophet Iſaiah: "every weapon which is formed againſt thee (the church) ſhall miſs, and every tongue, which riſes in judgment againſt thee, thou ſhalt condemn."—liv. 17. The writer's reaſoning on the paſſage, the caſtigator tranſcribes, and however irkſome to himſelf, and unpleaſant to this caſtigator, he again repeats it: "If the firſt reformer had weighed well the force of this promiſe, he would have ſeen that, as he himſelf did not compoſe the church, to which the promiſe was made, his oppoſition to her eſtabliſhed doctrine, placed him evidently amongſt theſe tongues, which riſe up in judgment againſt her, and that of courſe ſhe would condemn him. This reaſoning is applicable to every innovator, who has formed a party ſince the apoſtles' days. The argument

is

is insoluble if the examinant will admit that the promise was made to the catholic church; if he denies it let him assign some other church visible since the apostles days, without interruption or intermission." To this the castigator replies: "though the church of Rome has condemned and laid her murderous fangs as often as she could upon those who differ with her in sentiment, it is no evidence that she is the church of the Prince of Peace," p. 134. This is railing not reasoning: for whether the church of Rome be the church of the Prince of Peace or not, it is not the less true, that Jesus Christ had then on earth a church, which did not consist of Luther alone, he therefore was incontrovertibly one of these men, who rose up in judgment against it, and it condemned him, according to the promise. The ridiculous subterfuge of an invisible church is no evasion; for Luther was not a member of an invisible church, if such a phantom could exist; he was visible and tangible like other men. The castigator as a substitute for argument, fills two pages with invectives against papists; their doctrines and unmeaning ceremonies inflame his bile beyond its usual pitch, his indignation against the Romish church knows no bounds, by it millions of his ancestors have been persecuted to death. Full of the delphic spirit he prophesies: "We view the operations of God as hastening the approach of that period, when the friends of Christ shall join in halleluiahs, on beholding the smoke of her torment ascending up for ever and ever," p. 135. But as these invectives and oracles have no more reference to the writer's argument, than to the ebbing and flowing of the tide, they leave it insoluble as they found it, in full force against the first reformer, and of equal force against this castigator, and if he pretends to shelter himself in an invisible church, the writer will appeal to his *cara sposa* the partner of his pastoral cares, and she will attest that the castigator is visible and tangible like his neighbours.

In his next edition will he condescend to inform us where

where theſe millions of his anceſtors who were perſecuted to death concealed themſelves: it muſt have been in the regions of the moon, or the Iſland of *Utopia*: in Scotland there was ſcarcely one million, and they were all papiſts, when James V. in 1540, ordered four epicurean monks, who, to gratify the cravings of the belly, had renounced their frocks and vows, to be arreſted, and, without conſulting the Pope or any other prelate, ordered them for execution as diſturbers of the public tranquility; ſome other apoſtate Monks of the ſame ſtamp were diſpoſed of in the ſame way; when John Knox began to ſound the horn of diſcord there was ſome blood ſpilled on both ſides, that was not an uncommon thing in Scotland if their hiſtorians tell truth; however the Monks, who had renounced their frocks, being the more numerous, and the more clamorous, and having inflamed the minds of the people with virulent invectives, and calumnious miſrepreſentations, of the faith and morality of their brethren, who perſiſted in the obſervance of their vows, ſoon formed a ſtrong and infuriate party, and with their aſſiſtance pulled down both church and ſtate, deſtroyed all reli gious houſes, and pious inſtitutions, expelled the queen and her moſt faithful ſubjects, perſecuted, and yet continue to perſecute with unrelenting fury, all who refuſe to adopt their new opinions. This Edinburgh caſtigator, ſo converſant in the hiſtory of the primitive church, ought to know ſomething of the hiſtory of his own country.

He is at a loſs, he ſays, p. 136, to know what the writer calls *the firſt reformers*. By the firſt reformers, the writer means "the firſt inventors, the firſt founders, the firſt authors of what they call a Reformation, or what this caſtigator calls *re-aſſuming an original form*: for to re-aſſume an original form, is neither leſs nor more than to effect a Reformation; and where there is a reformation, there muſt be a reformer: for there is no relation without a ſubject, in which the relation is founded, as there can be no child without a father. The firſt in-

ventor, the firſt founder, the firſt author of the proteſtant reformation was Martin Luther, a Saxon monk, if we believe himſelf, though Zuinglius had the preſumption to claim that honour"—ſee Remarks. "There have been," he ſays, "at all times men who teſtified againſt papal uſurpations, and other pollutions of the church of Rome," p. 136. True, there have been men who abuſed the Pope, from Nicolas, of infamous memory, who abuſed St. Peter, down to this caſtigator, who abuſes all his ſucceſſors: but theſe men were not proteſtants: for Luther did not find one proteſtant in the world when he commenced the reformation; he himſelf was an arrant papiſt, and ſaid maſs religiouſly for many a year, and all his diſciples were papiſts, who renounced the faith in which they were baptiſed, and in which they lived until that unlucky period to embrace his reformation, nor did theſe railers againſt the pope form a viſible ſociety, perpetually exiſting, profeſſing the ſame faith, and united under the ſame head: on the contrary, their terms of communion were contradictory: what one ſect believed was anathematiſed by another: thus, for inſtance, the Neſtorians believed that in Jeſus Chriſt there are two perſons as well as two natures, the Eutychians believed but one nature and one perſon; the Pelagians believed man, by his free will, unaſſiſted by Divine grace, capable of fulfilling the whole law, the Calviniſts, on the contrary, aſſert that free will is extinct, and aſcribe the whole of man's ſalvation to grace alone. The Pelagians make the ſoldier fight without arms, and the Calviniſts make the arms fight without the ſoldier; they all unite in abuſing the pope, and that church, which is now viſible, was at all times viſible, and will continue viſible, that church, of which all the members, though diſperſed over the world, profeſs the ſame faith, participate the ſame ſacraments, and are united under the ſame head, whilſt hundreds of theſe jarring ſects have diſappeared, and are ſucceeded by others, which after making a little noiſe in the world, diſappear in turn, to make way for others,

others, who, to the end of time, will verify that prediction of St. Paul, 1ſt Cor. xi, 19: "there muſt be ſects amongſt you, that they who are approved may be publicly known," as in a rebellion, faithful ſubjects adhere to their prince, and thus atteſt their loyalty, whilſt the diſaffected unite with the leader or leaders of the rebellion; ſo in all theſe commotions, which hereſy has cauſed at different times, true chriſtians have perſevered with unſhaken conſtancy in the faith of their anceſtors, whilſt reſtleſs ſpirits, attracted by novelty, and deceived by the ſpirit of illuſion, formed ſects under their different leaders. Our anceſtors, ſays the caſtigator, always declared their doctrine founded upon the ſcriptures. True, ſo did all the different ſects, who have diſfigured the face of chriſtianity; they have always endeavoured to diſtort ſome paſſage of ſcripture to countenance their abſurd fables; but catholics have uniformly ſhewn that theſe fables have no foundation in ſcripture at all; that the ſenſe which they pretend to affix to the ſcriptures, in order to countenance their opinions, is not the genuine ſenſe, the ſenſe intended by the inſpired writers.

To juſtify the ſeparation of the reformed churches from the church of Rome, he cites ſome paſſages from St. Bernard, and other catholic writers, who declaimed vehemently againſt the immorality of many of the clergy. That there were many of the clergy corrupt and immoral, no man doubts; but theſe writers did not ſay that the faith of the church was corrupt, or that its diſcipline had any tendency to encourage immorality, on the contrary, theſe clergymen were impious becauſe they did not believe the doctrines of chriſtianity then taught, and they were corrupt and immoral, becauſe they did not obſerve the diſcipline of the church. However, of all theſe impious, corrupt, and immoral clergymen, Luther's reformation purged the church: they were the firſt to embrace it; the moſt zealous to ſupport it; of their old concubines they made new wives; picked up all the daughters of diſſipation, who diſhonoured ſome

convents,

convents, made them the partners of their paſtoral cares: for theſe were the firſt paſtors of all the reformed churches. Theſe are the men who the caſtigator calls his anceſtors.

The image of the beaſt, and this inviſible church, compoſed not of fairies, or other imaginary phantoms, but of mortals, with their fleſh and bones about them. are not quite ſatisfactory to our caſtigator: he ſpeaks of Huſſites, of Wicleſites, of Waldenſes, &c. but the Huſſites were not his anceſtors in any ſenſe: they were a Bohemian banditti, not proteſtants, and if they had been proteſtants they were not before John Huſs, who began to reform in 1409, the ſame is true of the Wicleſites: they were not proteſtants, nor had they any exiſtence before John Wiclef began to dogmatize in or near the year 1365. The Waldenſes were nothing leſs than proteſtants, and they commenced with Peter Waldo about the year 1136. The evangelical poverty, on which they reſted all hopes of ſalvation, and from which they obtained the appellation of *poor men of Lyons*, was not of Luther's taſte, though he had promiſed it in his early days he did not the leſs renounce it, together with the antiquated virtues of obedience and chaſtity. and the unprofitable auſterities of faſting, praying, &c. This caſtigator therefore muſt find his anceſtors elſewhere; however ſtrange it may appear, he finds ſome of them amongſt us papiſts. If by anceſtors he means the perſons, from whom he is lineally deſcended, they, as well as the anceſtors of all his countrymen, were indiſputably papiſts from the year 565, when the Picts in the northof Scotland were converted to chriſtianity, by the miniſtry of Colemkill and his aſſiſtants, monks of the old ſchool. The ſouthern Picts had been converted by the labours of St. Ninian in or about the year 426.—Bede L. iii, cap. 4. During a ſpace of nine hundred and ſeventy-five years, until the year 1540, when the four apoſtate friars, whom James Vth ordered to be arreſted, began to juſtify their apoſtacy by declaiming againſt monaſtic vows, and

their

their profligate ſenſuality, by crying down all auſterities as uſeleſs and unprofitable; but if by his anceſtors he mean proteſtants, the writer ſays, No. In the whole range of the chriſtian world, there was not one proteſtant when Luther began to preach. Of this truth Luther is himſelf the voucher, and if he did not atteſt it, the truth is not the leſs manifeſt; for though there have been at all times many corrupt and immoral men, and many good and pious men, who inveighed moſt bitterly againſt corruption and immorality; yet there never was, and there is not yet, a man within the pale of the chriſtian church who does not profeſs the faith, which is taught in it, and ſubmit his private opinions to its ſolemn deciſions, ſuch a man is not, nor can he be, a proteſtant.

To juſtify theſe his proteſtant anceſtors, whom his ſpirit of divination diſcovers where no proteſtant did ever exiſt, he ſays, p. 141, "even allowing the Romiſh church to be the church of Chriſt, which has holineſs as a characteriſtic, proteſtants may ſtill have good reaſon to charge her with ſuperſtition and idolatry." Be it ſo! We papiſts, though rank idolators, may yet be holy! Holy idolatry is a new combination of ideas: it reſembles a geometrical figure called *a ſquare circle*, the only property of which, as yet known to geometricians, is, the impoſſibility of conceiving or deſcribing it. Our Edinburgh caſtigator, in imitation of the Valentinians, the Manicheans, the Arians, Eunomians, &c. who found paſſages in ſcripture to authoriſe all the extravagant fables with which they peſtered the world, finds a paſſage to reconcile holineſs with idolatry. "Iſrael," ſays he, p. 142, "appears to have been guilty of ſome ſuperſtitious idolatry; and yet God acknowledged their relation to him as a church." My people, ſays he, aſk counſel of their ſtocks ..... they ſacrifice upon the tops of mountains and burn incenſe upon the hills.—Hos. iv, 12. He did not think proper to inſert the whole paſſage: the intermediate words, to which he has ſubſtituted points,

were

were not to his purpoſe: they ſhew that, if God acknowledged them for his people, they did not acknowledge him for their God, the intermediate words are: "the ſpirit of fornication has deceived them, and they have fornicated from their God." What, does the idiot pretend that God acknowledged profeſſed idolators for his church? God, he ſays, called them *his people*. True, what then? Does he know any people, who are not God's creatures? when did he ceaſe to be the God of the whole earth? But God did not call them a holy people; nor did God ſay that they had any relation to him as members of his church. This is the caſtigator's wild conjecture, which he modeſtly enough gives for authentic ſcripture. This is not a bad ſpecimen of the proofs adduced from ſcripture in ſupport of every fable, which is obtruded on the credulity of the uninformed multitude. Theſe men, of whom the prophet ſpeaks, were ſo far from being holy, that they were a moſt unſanctified people: for the prophet charges them not only with idolatry, but with almoſt every other atrocity which degrades human nature; they were of the Jewiſh race it is true, but not of the Jewiſh church; they had renounced it, and were then of the ſynagoue of Satan, whoſe chief reſidence was in Bethel, or, as the prophet called it in deriſion, Bethaven, that is, the houſe of iniquity. There were many members of the true church diſperſed amongſt the ten tribes, which from the time of ſchiſm effected by Jeroboam's impious policy, were called Iſrael or Ephraim; but they did not communicate with the idolators in their idolatrous worſhip, either in Bethel, where they ſacrificed to Jeroboam's calves, or on the tops of the mountains, where they ſacrificed to other idols: they communicated with the true church in Jeruſalem, where victims were offered, and incenſe burned, to the true God in the temple, according to the law of Moſes, by the high prieſt, the deſcendant of Aaron, whoſe ſpiritual authority was acknowledged by all the members of the true church. It is ſaid of Tobias, "when

" when all went to the golden calves, which Jeroboam, king of Iſrael, had made, he alone avoided the communion of them all ; but he went to Jeruſalem to the temple of the Lord, and there he adored the Lord God of Iſrael, offering faithfully his firſt fruits and tithes,"—Tob. i, 5. In the chapter cited by the caſtigator, Juda, in which tribe the true faith, as well as all the rites and ceremonies, by which all the members of the true church were united, under the repreſentative of Aaron, continued after the ſchiſm is clearly diſtinguiſhed from Iſrael the idolatrous Conventicle : " if thou Iſrael be guilty of fornication (idolatry) let not Juda ſin, do not go into Gilgal, and do not aſcend to Bethhaven."—16.

To this embarraſſing queſtion : " if the church be the aſſembly of ſaints, why do you ſeparate yourſelves from it," the caſtigator replies : " Let him (this writer) bethink himſelf whether proteſtants ſeparated themſelves, or were unjuſtly caſt out by the Romiſh church. When our anceſtors diſcovered the abominations, that were practiſed under the maſk of religion ought they to have quieted their conſciences with the conſideration that it was the church who did them." p. 142.

This inconſiderate reply convicts them of unwarrantable ſchiſm, for it admits that the Romiſh church, as he calls it, was at that point of time the aſſembly of ſaints ; it was therefore the church to which the promiſes were made, ſo clearly expreſſive of its perpetual and uninterrupted continuation until the end of time, that the caſtigator himſelf ſays, " proteſtants are as ſtrenuous ſupporters of this doctrine, as the Romiſh church ;" it was the church, of which Chriſt was the head, which he teaches by his miniſters ; which he preſerves as the apple of his eye, ſays the caſtigator, p. 133. In a word, it was that one church of Chriſt promiſed by the prophets, founded by the apoſtles, governed by their ſucceſſors, of which the angel Gabriel ſaid : " of it there will be no end."—Luke i. Either it ceaſed to exiſt at that point of time, or it continues to exiſt. If it ceaſed to exiſt, the

promiſes

promiſes were falſe, and chriſtianity an illuſion. If it continues to exiſt, it muſt continue in the ſame form. This truth has been already ſhewn to conviction, and is a ſelf-evident truth: for the ſame church can no more exiſt under a different form, than a man can exiſt under the form of an aſs, or a monarchy under the form of a republic. This is a direct proof, which requires more ſophiſtical powers than this Edinburgh caſtigator, aſſiſted by his ſpirit of divination, poſſeſſes to elude. To ſeparate from the church, to which the promiſes were made, and which in virtue of theſe promiſes muſt enjoy an uninterrupted exiſtence until the conſummation of time, is ſo manifeſtly a ſchiſm that the man is diveſted of common ſenſe, who denies it.

Whether theſe his anceſtors were unjuſtly caſt out of the Romiſh church, as the caſtigator ſays, or ſeparated themſelves from it, as the chriſtian world knows, he admits that they were in it: for if they were not in it the inſtant before the ſeparation, they could neither be caſt out of it, nor ſeparate themſelves from it. He thus acknowledges that theſe anceſtors, whom he ſought amongſt the Huſſites, Wicleſites, &c. were imaginary: not one of them was in the Romiſh church at that time. And whether the abominations with which he charges the Romiſh church be real or pretended, he admits that ſhe was the church of Chriſt: "ought they (his anceſtors) to have quieted their conſciences with the conſideration that it was the church who did them?" It is therefore true, that they were ſeparated from the church of Chriſt, and conſequently from Chriſt himſelf, who is head of his church, and teaches his church, by the miniſtry of its paſtors in regular ſucceſſion from the apoſtles, according to his promiſe.—Matt. ult. And it is equally true, that the church of Chriſt did not begin with them: it was in exiſtence fifteen centuries before, nor was it continued in them, for they had no predeceſſors, and without a predeceſſor there is no ſucceſſion or continuation. Theſe are intuitive truths which bear

no

no reply. However numerous the partisans or disciples of these his ancestors, who were unjustly, as he says, cast out of the Romish church, may be on the present day, it is not difficult to assign the time when they consisted of number *one*. Luther positively asserts it: "*at first I was alone*," "*primo solus eram*." His panegyrist Tillotson assures it: "*he stood a long time alone*." The day, the hour, even the instant before he began to dogmatise, the church existing without interruption was in being. All evasions are vain, subterfuges ridiculous: wild and extravagant declamations against real or imaginary abuses, virulent invectives against fictitious or existing abominations may divert the uninformed from the true state of the question, or enflame the enthusiastic; but they cannot convert truth into falsehood, nor can they transform an impostor into an apostle. Though many well-meaning men have been misled, seduced by the idle tales of reformation, it is not the less true that their teachers have been of the number of these men, whom the apostle Jude graphically describes: "but you my beloved remember the words, which were spoken by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ: for they have said to you that in the latter time there will be impostors, who will follow their sensual desires full of impiety; *these are they who separate themselves*," Jude v, 18, 19. This apostle, appealing to the authority of his fellow apostles, designates with the most accurate precision the characteristic of all impostors: "*they are*," says he "*the persons who separate themselves*." For as all the apostles had heard Jesus Christ declare that he would be with them until the end of time, Matt. ult. they rightly concluded that the succession of pastors and teachers, commenced in them, must continue until the end of time, hence a separation from that succession, they taught the faithful to consider as convincing evidence of imposture, and it is, in truth, the most plain and simple remedy against schism and heresy, that wisdom can prescribe. On the same principle St. Paul, speaking of the

the leader of a party, whom he emphatically calls *a heretic*: for his diſciples, though deceived by him, are not, properly ſpeaking, diſtinguiſhed by that epithet, ſays, that he is condemned by his own judgment "*autokatakritos:*" why ſo? Becauſe as he appears at the head of a party, and cannot name his predeceſſor, he publicly declares himſelf an innovator, ranks himſelf amongſt thoſe, who ſeparate themſelves, *òutoi eiſin òi apodiorizontes eautous, theſe are they who ſeparate themſelves*, Jude 19. His appeal to the ſcriptures is vain; his pretence of re-aſſuming the primitive form of the church, or of reinſtating the church in its primitive purity is an illuſion: if he cannot name his predeceſſor, he unequivocally ſeparates himſelf from the church then in being. St. Jude calls him an impoſtor, St. Paul calls him a *heretic ſelf-condemned*. His appeal to the ſcriptures is his condemnation: all impoſtors have appealed to the ſcriptures: it is the laſt reſource of impoſture: in the ſcripture there are many paſſages of ambiguous ſignification; impoſture eaſily finds one or more to countenance the opinion, which it intends to diſſeminate in order to form a party, then gives its deluded followers the ſenſe which it lends to the inſpired writers for authentic ſcriptures. This artifice of impoſture was in full force in the apoſtles' days, and has continued down to the preſent day: St. Peter ſays that the writings of St. Paul, in which there are ſome things not eaſily underſtood, "*duſnoeta*," were diſtorted by the unlearned and the unſettled to their own perdition, whilſt St. Paul was yet living, and theſe infatuated men did not confine themſelves to diſtort and pervert the writings of St. Paul: for Peter ſays that they diſtorted the other ſcriptures alſo, Pet. 2. iii. 16. The precaution, which the apoſtles preſcribed againſt this artifice of impoſture was ſimple and effectual: "but you my beloved remember the words which were ſpoken by the apoſtles of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: for they have ſaid to you, that in the latter time there will be impoſtors, who will follow their ſenſual deſires, "*Epithumias*," full of impiety:

theſe

these are they, who separate themselves.—Jude 19. By this simple rule, all impostors have been detected and confounded from Nicolas, one of the deacons, and Simon, the magician, who separated themselves from the church in the apostles days, down to John Knox, of trumpeting memory. However a sect might have increased in the course of time, or whatever length of time it might have continued, there was a time, and this time was not forgotten, when it consisted of the leader, and the few, who adopted his opinions: thus for instance, though the Arians had rapidly spread their opinions over many provinces in the East and the West, and had numbered many princes and prelates in their communion, yet there was a time when the sect consisted of Arius himself, the founder, and the few who adopted his opinions; when Alexander, patriarch of Alexandria, told Eusebius, of Nicomedia, that he thought the whole church confined within his own person, and two or three more of his faction—Epi. 1 & 2, ant. Con. Nic.; when the few seduced by that arch-impostor were known by their names; seven or eight deacons, and three or four bishops, who were immediately anathematised by their patriarch at the head of one hundred bishops of Lybia, and again more solemnly by the council of Nice. What the patriarch said at that time the catholic church repeats: "we know but one catholic and apostolical church, which cannot be destroyed by the united efforts of the world combined against it, and before it all heresies must fall."—Epis. 2. ad om. Epis. The same is true of the Nestorians; though their opinions spread like wild fire through the east, and a vast extent of country is yet infected with their errors, yet there was a time, when the sect was composed of Nestorius himself, and one man, whom he engaged to preach in his cathedral of Constantinople where the people heard him with horror; a time when Dalmatius said to the emperor: "will you listen to one impious man rather than to six thousand bishops?"—Ap. Dal. ad.

ad. Theo. Thus without farther diſcuſſion all impoſtures are detected, the founder of the ſect ceaſes to believe the faith, which he himſelf profeſſed to believe, the faith in which he was baptiſed, ſeparates himſelf, and by the very fact condemns himſelf. See Tertullian's reaſoning on the ſubject.—*Remarks*, p. 141.

The Caſtigator, whoſe conſcience ſeems to be of an accommodating texture, if we may judge from the ſpecimen before us: it permits him to falſify the ſcriptures; to garble the fathers; to aſperſe the memory of the dead, of whom he knows nothing, in order to bring an odium on the living, to whom he inſidiouſly imputes doctrines which they deteſt; thinks that his anceſtors ought not to quiet their conſciences ſeeing the abominations which the church did, p. 142. If they themſelves were not guilty of theſe abominations, the writer ſees no reaſon for that pretended anxiety of conſcience: monſtrous crimes are daily committed for which the guilty are perſonally accountable, not the innocent; the crimes and exceſſes of many miniſters of the Jewiſh church were public and atrocious in Jeremiah's days; he inveighed moſt bitterly againſt the crimes of the princes, the prieſts and the people; but he did not ſeparate himſelf from the communion of the church: he communicated with them very prieſts, whom he cenſured in the temple, aſſiſted at their ſacrifices and public offices, endeavoured to reclaim them, but did not preſume to reform the faith of their church or withdraw himſelf from the temporal juriſdiction of the prince, or the ſpiritual authority of the high prieſt. The prophet Samuel did not ſeparate himſelf from the communion of Heli's two ſons, who miniſtered in the temple under their father, though their conduct in the miniſtry was notoriouſly ſcandalous; nor did he preſume to change the order of the prieſthood on that account: for we find Achias brother to Achitob, ſon to Phineas one of theſe wicked prieſts, high prieſt in Saul's days.—1ſt Sam. xiv. 3. The miniſters of the temple were corrupt in Herod's days,

days, yet the Baptiſt's father did not ſeparate himſelf from their communion, on the contrary he miniſtered with them; nor did the venerable Simeon withdraw himſelf from the temple: he was there when the virgin came to preſent her ſon according to the law, and the propheteſs Anna daughter to Phanuel did not depart from the temple, ſerving God night and day, with faſting and prayer in a ſtate of widowhood from her early days, Luke ii, 36, that is, ſerving God by all theſe *unprofitable auſterities*, and *nonſenſical rites* which Luther and his aſſociates renounced, and which this caſtigator hates, as do all the ſons of Epicurus.

Finally, the Saviour himſelf, though he ſeverely cenſured the doctors of the law, the Scribes and Phariſees, continued to communicate with them in the temple, until the cloſe of his mortal life. He acknowledged that the ſource of true religion was in Jeruſalem; that the true faith was there, not elſewhere; though the ſchiſm of Samaria had commenced immediately after the death of Solomon, and had continued under different princes during a ſpace of one thouſand years, the Saviour did not the leſs condemn it: in his anſwer to the Samaritan woman he ſaid: "you (the Samaritans) adore what you do not know; we (the Jews) adore what we know, *becauſe ſalvation is from the Jews*," John iv, 22. "And when he healed the lepers he ſent the Samaritan to the prieſts in Jeruſalem, as well as the Jews," Luke xvii, 14.

This delicacy of conſcience, which would not permit the caſtigator's anceſtors to continue in the church of Rome, though confeſſedly the true church at the time, ſeems to be of a fading nature: it was diſcoloured when Luther, offended at the oppoſition of the Zuinglians to his doctrine of the real preſence, beſtowed on them with a liberality bordering on profuſion theſe favourite epithets which he had in reſerve for the pope, ſuch as *damned fellows who dragged others to hell; ſenſeleſs fellows, worthleſs damned miſcreants for whom it was not lawful to pray*; encircling the Zuinglians with devils

within

within and without, above and below, behind and before, to the right and the left, T. 2. f. 305. The Zuinglians in return called him *new Pope, new Antichrist*, they publiſhed a work yet extant which they entitled: *Againſt the vain and ſcandalous calumnies of Luther*. In it they ſay: that people muſt be as ſenſeleſs as he, to bear his extravagance, that he diſhonoured his old age, made himſelf contemptible by his violence; that he ought to be aſhamed to fill his book with ſo many offenſive expreſſions, and ſo many devils. In truth he has left us ſome anecdotes which intimate that he was extremely familiar with the ſpirit of darkneſs: he ſays: "believe me I know the devil well, yea very well," Tom. 2. Ed. Jena fol. 77. In an epiſtle to the Elector of Saxony he ſays: "the devil ſometimes dances through my brain ſo that I can neither write nor read," Tom. 5. p. 485. In another place he ſays: "ſometimes he walks with me in the bed chamber, when I am with men he does not hurt me, but when he finds me alone he teaches me manners," Col. men. f. 275. "I have," ſays he, "elſewhere, a couple of wonderful devils by whom I am diligently and attentively watched: they are not vulgar, but great demons, yea amongſt the devils they are great doctors in theology," *ibid*, f. 231. If we believe him this ſpirit of darkneſs ſlept with him more cloſely and more frequently than his wife Catharine Borèe, "*Diabolus multo frequentius et proprius mihi accubare ſolet quam mea Catharina*," *ibid*. f. 219. The diſciples of Zuinglius were therefore juſtified in ſaying that he ought to be aſhamed of filling his works with ſo many devils. Luther's delicacy of conſcience muſt have been ſomething more than faded when he and his friends and fellow reformers *Philip Melancton*, *Martin Bucer*, *Anthony Corvin*, *Adam John Leningue*, *Juſtus Winferte* and *Denis Melanter*, authoriſed the Landgrave of Heſſe to cohabit with his two wives at the ſame time—See Review p. 131.

We cannot but admire the tenderneſs of theſe men's conſcience, which would not permit them to continue

in

in the Romiſh church ſeeing the abominations, which they ſaw; of theſe, however, the greateſt would have eſcaped Luther's notice, if that ſpirit of darkneſs, with whom he was ſo well acquainted, had not informed him. —See his conference with the fiend. Review, p. 130.

Zuinglius too ſuffered great anguiſh of mind whilſt he continued pariſh prieſt of Notre Dame des Hermites, in the canton of Zurich; but the Reformation having relieved him from *unprofitable auſterities*, *nonſenſical rites*, and all religious reſtraints, which the ſimplicity of the apoſtles, and their immediate ſucceſſors, thought neceſſary for the ſanctification of the miniſters of the church; and the rich young widow having cheered his ſpirits, depreſſed by theſe abominations, his anxiety ſubſided; his conſcience was dilated; he could then join in communion with Hercules, Theſeus, Numa, and all the gods and heroes of fable.—See Review, p. 132. The writer is left to conjecture, whether this Edinburgh caſtigator dates his pedigree from Luther or Zuinglius; but as he calls himſelf a proteſtant, and ſays that his anceſtors were caſt out of the Romiſh church, he muſt of all neceſſity date from either the one or the other: for it is incontrovertibly true, that they have been the firſt founders of the two grand diviſions of the Reformation; and, however numerous or diſcordant the ſub-diviſions, they muſt all date from this fixed point.

This boaſted tenderneſs of conſcience, is well deſcribed by Eraſmus, a cotemporary writer, who was in the confidence of the party, though he did not think proper to unite with them. "What ſort of an evangelical race is this?" ſaid he, "never was any thing ſeen more licentious, more ſeditious, or leſs evangelical than theſe pretended Goſpellers, they retrench vigils and offices of night and day; becauſe they are, ſay they, Phariſaical ſuperſtitions; but they ought to replace them with ſomething better. They ought not to become Epicurians to avoid Judaiſm, they eradicate inſtead of weeding; they ſet fire to the houſe inſtead of ſweeping it. Luxury, debauchery,

debauchery, adultery are multiplied more than ever; there is no rule, no diſcipline; the people indocile, diſobedient, having rejected the yoke of their ſuperiors, will believe no body; in this confuſed licentiouſneſs Luther will ſoon have to regret what he called the tyranny of biſhops."

He reproached them with the malice of *Capiton*, the malignant ſlander of *Farel* and *Oecolampadius*, at whoſe table he lived, and whoſe arrogance he neither could bear nor ſuppreſs, he reproached them with the violence of Zuinglius and Luther, who ſometimes affected the air of an apoſtle, and immediately after deſcended to the loweſt buffoonery; the others, whom he knew were not better, L. xxxi. Theſe men ſo conſcientious ought not to quiet their conſciences ſeeing the abominations of the Romiſh church, ſo they diſmiſſed her from their communion! Half a dozen profligate and perjured monks diſmiſſed from their communion more than one hundred millions of Chriſtians, who acknowledged the ſpiritual juriſdiction of the See of Rome! Yes, juſt as the ſhip diſmiſſes the ſhore, or as the bucket of water diſmiſſes the river.

His anceſtors, the caſtigator ſays, only imitated the conduct of the firſt diſciples of Chriſt, who were caſt out of the Jewiſh ſynagogue. Is it not ſtrange that his ſpirit of divination ſhould paſs unnoticed ſome hundreds of ſects, which have ſhared the ſame fate, and fix on one which has nothing in common with his anceſtors? The firſt diſciples of Chriſt did not pretend to reform the Jewiſh Church; they did not charge the Prieſts with teaching errors in faith: on the contrary from the faith of that church, founded on the prophecies, for the authenticity of which that Church anſwered, they ſhewed that the rites and ceremonies of the moſaic law, were temporary, and muſt have an end. St. Paul, in his Epiſtle to the Hebrews, vii and viii, invincibly demonſtrates that the Jewiſh Prieſthood muſt be transferred, and conſequently that the Jewiſh Law muſt

ceaſe

ceaſe: becauſe all its ſacraments, ſacrifices, rites and ceremonies, of which the Prieſts were the miniſters, muſt ceaſe with their miniſtry. Did his anceſtors ſhew by any document whatſoever that the Prieſthood of the new Law was to be transferred? That all its rites and ceremonies were to ceaſe with its miniſtry? Does the Prophecy of Jeremiah, on which St. Paul reſted an irreſiſtible proof that a new covenant would ſucceed the old, ſay that this new covenant would itſelf be ſucceeded by another? What Prophet or Apoſtle has predicted a ceſſation of the Law of Grace? A tranſlation of the Prieſthood? A ſuppreſſion of its rites and ceremonies? His anceſtors, therefore, did not imitate the diſciples of Chriſt: for if they withdrew their obedience from the Jewiſh prieſthood, it was becauſe its authority was transferred and their obedience with it; but his anceſtors withdrew their obedience from a prieſthood, which was not then, nor ever will be transferred. This may be a ſubject of meditation for this Edinburgh caſtigator in his ſerious moments.

This, though an eſſential difference between his anceſtors and the diſciples of Chriſt, is not the only one: the firſt paſtors of the Chriſtian church were not prieſts of the Jewiſh church, they derived no ſpiritual powers or authority whatever from it; nor were they ſent by their Divine Maſter to reform the ſynagogue: they were ſent by him, not to reform a church which no longer exiſted, but to form a church, in the formation of which he himſelf promiſed to aſſiſt, againſt which he ſaid that the powers of darkneſs would never prevail; a church which has enjoyed and will continue to enjoy an uninterrupted exiſtence until the end of time, ſo ſays the caſtigator. To form this church he ordered them to teach and baptiſe; their authority therefore to teach and baptiſe was not derived from the Jewiſh prieſthood, nor from the Jewiſh people, nor from any other civil or eccleſiaſtical power on earth, it was conferred by him in whom all ſpiritual authority reſides, as

in its ſource; by Jeſus Chriſt the *High Prieſt*, who was inſtituted by an oath, as St. Paul ſays, Heb. vii, viii, the *Great Shepherd* of the flock, and through them it deſcends to their ſucceſſors in office, and will continue without interruption until the end of time—Another ſubject of meditation for this caſtigating paſtor. His anceſtors were prieſts of the Chriſtian church, ordained in it according to the rites of primitive inſtitution, were baptiſed in it, had promiſed obedience to it, derived from it all authority to teach and baptiſe; they withdrew their promiſed obedience; ſeparated themſelves from it; literally verified the prediction of St. Jude and his fellow apoſtles, ſaying: "in the latter time there will be impoſtors: theſe are they who ſeparate themſelves." This is a ſecond and ſtriking difference between his anceſtors and the diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt.

There is another difference, which may have eſcaped the notice of this paſtor, whoſe chief care is the propagation of the human ſpecies: the firſt diſciples renounced all things to follow Jeſus Chriſt: "behold, ſaid Peter, we have forſaken all things," Matt. xix. They literally reduced to practiſe that advice, which the Saviour gave the young man, *ibid.* "if you deſire to be perfect, go, ſell all your poſſeſſions and give to the poor; and you will have a treaſure in Heaven, and come and follow me." It does not appear that the Saviour directed him to go and take a wife; or to retain a certain portion of his poſſeſſions for the ſupport of a wife and family; he was therefore clearly of opinion, that perfection was attainable, without the practice of that new modelled virtue, which conſiſts in propagating the human ſpecies.

The caſtigator's venerable anceſtors inſtructed by that ſpirit, of which this venerable paſtor inherits a double portion, diſcovered that the apoſtles were dupes; that the Saviour himſelf was either deceived, or a deceiver; that to have forſaken all things to follow Chriſt was an abomination;

nation; and that perfection was not attainable without the practiſe of that virtue, for which antiquity knew no name. Thus enlightened they publicly reſumed all theſe good things, which they had ſolemnly renounced.

Finally, the diſciples, did not enrich themſelves by the plunder of the Jewiſh ſynagogues; they did not appropriate to themſelves, to their wives or their daughters, the ornaments of idols; they did not tempt the avarice of princes by the pillage of temples; nor encourage their ſenſuality by authoriſing polygamy contrary to the injunction of their Divine Maſter; that the anceſtors of this caſtigator have plundered convents, monaſteries, and churches, that they and their diſciples have enriched themſelves with the funds, which the piety of our anceſtors had devoted to the ſupport of religious communities is a fact, which the world knows; a fact atteſted by the truly venerable ruins of theſe ancient monuments of true piety. The writer is at a loſs to diſcover any one trait of reſemblance between the boaſted anceſtors of this caſtigator and the immediate diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt.

In his next page he reaſons with Bellarmine, who ſays, that the true church only ſubſiſts where there is an union of the members with the head: he concludes from this that the church is annihilated by the demiſe of the pope, Bellarmine would reply that without ſome bond of union there is no ſociety at all; that a moral body poſſeſſed of inherent powers to conſtitute a preſident is not affected by the death or phyſical deſtruction of ſuch preſident; but if the body itſelf be deſtitute of ſuch a power then it ceaſes to be a moral body, it ceaſes to exiſt: for a moral body can no more exiſt without a moral head, or an inherent power of conſtituting ſuch head, than a natural body can exiſt without a natural head. Bellarmine would tell him that there is this difference between a natural and a moral body; that in the natural body the phyſical deſtruction of the head, deſtroys the individual, becauſe there is no inherent power in the natural body to reinſtate

reinſtate the head, whereas the phyſical deſtruction of any member, does not deſtroy the moral body whilſt its inherent power of reinſtating that member continues entire, and hence he would conclude, that in the new modelled ſyſtem of this caſtigator, there can be nothing like a chriſtian church; why ſo? Becauſe there is no bond of union, there is no *one faith*, each man forms his own opinion; there is no preſident veſted with ſpiritual authority nor any inherent power of conſtituting him, for they neither individually, nor collectively poſſeſs any ſpiritual authority; that muſt of all neceſſity deſcend from Jeſus Chriſt, through his apoſtles and their ſucceſſors in office; for though all civil power be originally veſted in ſociety by its author as indiſpenſably neceſſary for its ſupport, and may of courſe be conferred by the people on their firſt magiſtrate, and his miniſters, becauſe in that quality they are the creatures of the people, yet the people can confer no authority whatſoever on Jeſus Chriſt, or his miniſters: for they are not the creatures of the people. Jeſus Chriſt is in himſelf, and by himſelf Sovereign of his Kingdom; the people who compoſe his Kingdom are choſen by him; he is not appointed or conſtituted King by them; they confer no powers on him; all powers neceſſary for the government of his kingdom, that is, his church, are veſted in him, and muſt be derived from him, the people neither appoint nor conſtitute his miniſters: for they are not the creatures of the people, as he himſelf is not the creature of the people; his miniſters therefore muſt be appointed by himſelf, muſt receive all powers of teaching and feeding his flock, from himſelf; and this power, originally conferred by him on the firſt paſtors of his flock, muſt be continued in their ſucceſſors appointed according to his inſtitution, whilſt his flock continues to exiſt in this ſublunary world, that is, until time ſhall be no more, hence it follows that all teachers and paſtors, ſelf-conſtituted, though admitted by the people, or elected and conſtituted by the people, may be the miniſters of the people, but they are not, nor

can

can they be, the miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt, they have not, nor can they have, any ſpiritual powers or authority whatſoever in the Spiritual Kingdom of Jeſus Chriſt, for this ſimple but irreſiſtible reaſon, which the writer once more repeats, becauſe the people have conferred no powers on Jeſus Chriſt, nor can they on his miniſters; Jeſus Chriſt receives no laws from his people; they muſt receive laws from him, and theſe laws muſt be taught and enforced not by their miniſters, but by his. Againſt this reaſoning all declamation is vain: it precludes evaſion, the underſtanding muſt be horribly perverted which refuſes its aſſent. This is the reply which Bellarmine would make, and though it may not be ſatisfactory to preaching weavers, and tailors, and tinkers, &c. who obtrude their nonſenſe on a credulous populace, it is not the leſs ſolid, the leſs founded in truth, and common ſenſe.

In the next paragraph he aſks where was the church before the council of Trent? To which the writer replies it was then where it is now, the church of all nations, it is not circumſcribed by geographical dimenſions, nor limited by ages. It does not reſemble thoſe ephemeral ſects, which occaſionally appear, and are confined to certain diſtricts, of which the world never hears. Is the man ſo unaccountably ignorant as not to know, what every proteſtant ſchool boy knows, that the Council of Trent ſo far from making any alteration in the ancient faith or form of the Church confirmed them by its deciſions: and anathematiſed the errors and paradoxes of Luther and his reforming aſſociates, as their anceſtors in the Council of Nice condemned the errors of Arius, as in the Council of Epheſus they condemned the errors of Neſtorius, and in the Council of Chalcedon the dreams of Eutyches, thus have the ravings of all Reformiſts been condemned by the paſtors of Chriſt's Church, literally verifying the prophecy of Iſaias: "every tongue which riſes in judgment againſt thee thou ſhalt condemn."

To

To his query, if Leo the Great was for receiving the eucharist only in one kind? The writer replies: that in Leo's days, and before them, the eucharist was received indifferently under one, or both kinds by the faithful; that then as well as now the eucharist was received under both kinds by the officiating minister. Of this truth the passage, which Illyricus garbled from Leo's fourth sermon on the Lent, (to which this castigator seems to allude, though he does not cite it, unwilling perhaps to inform his disciples that this *unprofitable austerity* was observed in the primitive church) is sufficient evidence: in it that venerable pontiff directs the people to observe those, who never received the cup. The Manicheans, who had fled from Carthage, when taken by the Vandals in 439, took refuge in Rome; to evade the severity of the imperial laws, they concealed their impiety, feigned themselves Catholics, with them received the communion in the churches, but never under the species of wine: because they thought wine the gall of the dragon, created by the devil; if it had not been customary to make the communion under the species of bread alone, the pope's direction would have been useless: they would have been detected on their first appearance at the holy table, many of them were by this precaution detected and confessed in presence of the most illustrious senators, some horrible impieties and abominations.—*Leo. Ep.* 15, *ad Tur.* The same order was renewed by Gelasius in 496 for the same reason; but when the Manicheans ceased to infest the churches, these orders became useless and ceased by disuse, generally all laws occasioned by circumstances cease to oblige, when the circumstances, on which they are founded, cease to exist.

An irresistible proof of this truth, is taken from the ancient practice of the Greek church: in that church during the whole Lent, the sacrifice was offered but on Saturdays and Sundays, on these days the eucharist was reserved under the species of bread alone, and received under that species solely the other days of the week.

This

This they called *præſanctified.* The ſame cuſtom was always obſerved, and continues yet in the Latin Church, on Good Friday. The cuſtom of the Greeks is mentioned in the Council of Laodicea, can. 49, and by the Council of Trull, can. 52. The cuſtom of the Latin church is mentioned by Innocent 1ſt, Epis. 1. cap. 4. The writer adds one proof more, which bears no reply: the euchariſt in the primitive church was given to the faithful, that when through the violence of perſecution they could not meet in their oratories, they might make the communion at home; but under the ſpecies of wine it was never given but from the chalice by the prieſt or his deacon, this is atteſted by all eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, even Kemnitz admits it, but ridiculouſly endeavours to elude the force of truth, by ſaying that they who received the communion under the ſpecies of bread at home, received it under the ſpecies of wine in the church. This attempt at evaſion, if true, would only prove that the communion was made indifferently under the ſpecies of wine, as under the ſpecies of bread: for it could not be the ſame communion that was made one day in the church and ſome days after at home.

Our caſtigator continues his queries: would Gregory the Great ſupport the worſhip of images? Never was man ſo unlucky in his ſelection of Fathers for the condemnation of popery: there are no monuments more authentic than theſe which atteſt Gregory's veneration, for the ſaints, their relicks, and their images; when he ſent Auſtin, the monk, to England to attempt the converſion of our idolatrous anceſtors, he gave him many rich veſtments, veſſels and relicks. The original inventory made by Thomas of Elenham in the reign of Henry V. is ſaid to be preſerved in the Harleian library,—ſee Butler in the life of Gregory; he ſent to Theodolinda, queen of the Lombards, a particle of the holy croſs to be worn about the neck of her infant ſon. In his letter to that princeſs, dated in January, 604, Seventh Indiction, he ſays: "I ſend to the prince Adeodalde, your ſon, a croſs

croſs, with ſome of the wood of the true croſs, and a goſpel in a Perſian box; he ſent to the empreſs Conſtantina a veil, in Latin called *brandeum*, which had touched the bodies of the apoſtles, ſaying, that miracles had been wrought by ſuch relicks—L. iv, Epiſ. 30. At Cagliari, a wealthy Jew had embraced the chriſtian religion, but retaining ſomething of the Jew he ſeized the ſynagogue, placed in it an image of the Virgin Mary and a Croſs. On complaint of the Jews, Gregory ordered the ſynagogue to be reſtored, having previouſly removed the image and croſs *with due veneration*: "*ſublatâ exinde, quâ par eſt veneratione imagine et cruce.*"—L. 9, Epi. 6. Secundius, a man of remarkable piety, god-father to the young prince Adeodalde, prayed Gregory to ſend him ſome devout pictures; in his anſwer Gregory ſays: "we have ſent you two cloths containing the picture of God our Saviour, and of Mary the holy mother of God, and of the bleſſed apoſtles Peter and Paul, and one croſs, and for a benediction a key which has been applied to the moſt holy body of St. Peter, prince of the apoſtles, that you may remain defended from the enemy." Theſe words are cited by Paul, the deacon, and by Adrian I. in his letter to Charlemagne. When Serenus, biſhop of Marſeilles, had broken certain ſacred images, which perſons lately converted from idolatry, in his dioceſs, adored as they did their idols, Gregory commended the zeal of the biſhop in ſuppreſſing that monſtrous abuſe; but reprimanded him for breaking the images.—Lib. xi, Epiſ. 13. He frequently cenſured the impiety of paying an idolatrous worſhip to images; an impiety, which catholics have always condemned; hence in his letter to Secundinus he ſays: "I know that you do not aſk the image of the Saviour to worſhip it as a God; but that, in remembrance of the Son of God, you may be inflamed with his love—Lib. 7, Ep. 53.

From theſe paſſages, in which Gregory cenſured the idolatrous worſhip of images, this caſtigator pretends to conclude that he condemned that religious reſpect and veneration,

veneration, which he himſelf paid to the images of the Saviour, and of his elect. Thus, in imitation of his anceſtors, who, in the face of truth and conviction, taught their infatuated followers to believe that there is no difference, or diſtinction, between that reverence and veneration, which the Catholic church pays to the angels and ſaints, and the divine honour, and ſovereign homage, which is due to the Almighty God alone, whoſe creatures they are, this caſtigator artfully endeavours to continue the deluſion.

His next query is, if pope Gelaſius was a defender of tranſubſtantiation? To which the writer replies that, that venerable pontiff believed and profeſſed the doctrine taught in, and by the catholic church, which was that of tranſubſtantiation in his time, before his time, and after it, as he cites no paſſage from this pope, the writer preſumes that he alludes to a paſſage garbled by Kemnitz from a writer of the ſame name, whom he ignorantly confounds with that pontiff. This Gelaſius, let him be who he will is perfectly orthodox: in his book of the two natures in Chriſt, he reaſons on the euchariſt as Theodoret did, whoſe reaſoning on the ſubject has been diſcuſſed, Review p. 210.

His laſt query were Cyprian, Auſtin, the council of Chalcedon, and the African biſhops for appeals to Rome and ſubmiſſion to the pope's juriſdiction? Has been already diſcuſſed in all its parts, they have been all ſhewn to be perfectly ſubmiſſive to the pope's ſpiritual juriſdiction; whatever they might have thought of appeals in perſonal cauſes, which were frequently abuſive, they never doubted the ſupremacy of Peter and his ſucceſſors in office. From theſe his queries, in ſupport of which he has not offered even the ſhadow of proof, the caſtigator aſks: What right we have to appropriate indefectibility to the Romiſh church? To which the writer replies: Becauſe the Romiſh church, as he calls her, that is, the church in communion with the See of Rome, acknowledging the ſpiritual juriſdiction of the Roman pontiff,

is now, what she always was, and ever will be, that *one*, *holy*, *catholic* and *apostolical* church, to which the promises were made so clearly expressive of her indefectibility, that this castigator says, p. 133, "protestants are as strenuous supporters of this doctrine as the Romish church," and from this doctrine he concludes as he did before, that any church, the commencement of which is fixed at any time since the apostles' days, is not the Church of Christ: because it manifestly is not that church, to which the promise of indefectibility was made.

In his next chapter, p. 144, the castigator says, the doctrine of perpetual visibility proves at least as much for protestants as for the Romish Church. If his spirit of divination can discover, and will condescend to inform us, in what country there was a society of protestants perpetually visible since the apostles days; in what See there has been a succession of protestant bishops, in what city, town, village or hamlet, there has been a succession of protestant ministers of any description or denomination perpetually visible since the apostles time, this assertion however wild and paradoxical will be admitted. The Romish Church shews a society perpetually visible, an uninterrupted succession of bishops in the same See since the apostles days; she shews that these her bishops in regular succession were in communion with the bishops of other Sees; that the bishops of other Sees from their communion with the See of Rome, shewed that they themselves were rightful pastors, true members of the Catholic church, professing the true faith, as Ireneus of Lyons, Austin of Hippo, Optatus of Milevium, &c. This they shew with such irresistible evidence that Protestants are forced to admit it: Doctor Reynolds, in his Conference with Huss, p. 442, says: "that the succession of the Roman bishops was a proof of the true faith in the time of Austin, Optatus, Tertullian, &c." Dr. Thorndyke, speaking of the Councils in the East, says: "of these Councils how many can be called general by number

ber of the preſent votes? Their authority then, muſt ariſe from their admiſſion by the Weſtern Churches; and this admiſſion what elſe can it be aſcribed to, but the authority of the Church of Rome eminently involved above all the Churches of the Weſt in the ſummoning of them and by conſequence of their decrees? And in the troubles between the Eaſt and the Weſt, though the Weſtern Churches have acted by their repreſentatives in great Councils; yet on other occaſions, they ſeem to have referred themſelves to that church, reſolving to regulate themſelves by it; *whereby it appears that the Weſtern Churches went always with that of Rome*, which neceſſarily argues a ſingular pre-eminence in it,"—See Epilogue Book iii, ch. 20, p. 179. Whether this union of all the Weſtern Churches with the church of Rome, argues a pre-eminence or not, it proves beyond a contradiction that the Church of Rome was always viſible; that all the churches in the Weſt were of its communion, conſequently that before the Reformation there was no Proteſtant Church in the Weſt: perhaps the caſtigator's ſpirit of divination may diſcover ſome latent Proteſtant Church in the Eaſt, which has hitherto eſcaped the world's obſervation.

Of the many paſſages in ſcripture promiſing the uninterrupted exiſtence of Chriſt's church adduced by this writer, in his remarks, p. 110, the Caſtigator makes an aukward attempt to wreſt one to his purpoſe. It is from Iſaiah ii. "And it ſhall come to paſs in the laſt days that the mountain of the Lord's Houſe ſhall be eſtabliſhed in the top of the mountains, and ſhall be exalted above the hills." Theſe words, if we believe him, are not applicable to every ſtate of the church. The church, in his opinion, has different ſtates, from his words we muſt conclude that one ſtate of the church is viſible, to which the promiſes apply; the other ſtate is inviſible, to which the promiſes are not applicable; common ſenſe would tell him that one ſtate is real, which the prophet announces; the other imaginary, of

which

which the prophet knew nothing: he aſks if the doctrine of viſibility applies to the days of Elijah? To this the writer replies that the doctrine of viſibility does apply to the days of Elijah, and to every ſtage of the Jewiſh church from its firſt eſtabliſhment to its final ceſſation, but the paſſage which the caſtigator aukwardly endeavours to fit to his purpoſe, does not apply to the days of Elijah, or to any other ſtage of the Jewiſh church at all. The paſſage is ſo clearly underſtood of the chriſtian church that ignorance itſelf can hardly miſtake it, and in it the prophet announces not only the viſibility, but the catholicity of the church, he thus continues: "*and all nations ſhall flow unto it.*" See remarks p. 110 . . . . his ſpirit of divination finding ſome difficulty in applying this ſentence to the Jewiſh church wiſely ſuppreſſed it. Doctor Southwell, whoſe memory was never aſperſed with a diſtant ſuſpicion of popery, ſays, in his expoſitory note on this chapter: "by the laſt days is meant the time of the goſpel diſpenſation," though this paſſage be not applicable to the Jewiſh church, it is not the leſs true that, that church was from its firſt eſtabliſhment to its final ceſſation viſible without interruption, and under the immediate protection and unremitting vigilance of divine providence. This the inſpired writers atteſt in language which is not to be miſunderſtood: Jeremiah, one of their lateſt and greateſt prophets, ſays: xi, 6, 7. "and Jehovah, ſaid to me: proclaim all theſe words in the cities of Juda, and in the ſtreets of Jeruſalem, ſaying: hear ye the words of this covenant, and do them for proteſting, I have proteſted to your fathers *on the day when I brought them up from the land of Egypt and to the preſent day*, riſing early and proteſting, ſaying hear my voice;" the voice of inſtruction by God's miniſters was therefore inceſſantly heard by the Jews, and this inſtruction was not given by inviſible miniſters or to an inviſible people. The Jewiſh church was inſtructed by the prophets and the prieſts with unremitting attention: "from the thirteenth year of Joſiah, ſon of Amon,

Amon, king of Juda, and to this day, this the twenty third year, the word of Jehovah was on me, and I have ſpoken to you riſing early and ſpeaking, and ye have not hearkened; and Jehovah ſent to you all his ſervants, the prophets, riſing early and ſending, and you did not hearken nor did you incline your ear to hear."—Jer. xxv, 3, 4. This prophet pathetically deſcribes the vigilance of Divine Providence, and the unwearied attention of himſelf, and all the prophets, his predeceſſors, to the inſtruction of the Jews. Though the miſſion of the prophets may appear extraordinary, yet it continued without intermiſſion, until after the return from the Babylonian captivity: the ſcripture ſpeaks of them as forming a corps, a ſociety, it ſpeaks of their habitations, of their children: "and the ſons of the prophets, who were at Jericho, came to Eliſha, and ſaid to him, knoweſt thou that Jehovah, will take away thy Lord from thy head this day." —2d Kings, ii, 5. This Lord, of whom the ſons of the prophets at Jericho ſpoke, was Elijah, in whoſe days, if we believe the caſtigator, the Jewiſh church was inviſible: an inviſible church, in which that great prophet propheſied, and inſtructed the people! An inviſible church, in which the ſcriptures and the law of Moſes were explained in the public ſchools even in Jericho! For by the ſons of the prophets are underſtood, ſays Dr. Southwell, the young men who ſtudied under the aged ones, the church was therefore perfectly viſible, even in Iſrael, amongſt the ſchiſmatical tribes, and notwithſtanding the number of prophets maſſacred by Jezabel, even the impious idolator Achab knew where a prophet of the true God was to be found: when Jehoſaphat, king of Juda, deſired that a prophet of the true God might be conſulted on the war with Syria, Achab replied: "there is yet one man, Michaiah the ſon of Imlah, by whom we may inquire from Jehovah, but I hate him; for he propheſies no good for me, but evil."—1ſt Kings, xxii, 8. Though the church ſhould have been abſolutely extinct; and the extraordinary miniſtry of the prophets with

with the ordinary miniſtry of the prieſts and Levites, aboliſhed, which did not happen, in the ten tribes diſtinguiſhed by the name of Iſrael, the church was never more viſible than it was at that time in Jeruſalem, and in the whole kingdom of Judah, under the good king Jehoſaphat.

In times of the greateſt affliction under Achaz, Iſaias preached and propheſied; in that time of deepeſt diſtreſs before the captivity, Jeremiah preached, nor did he ceaſe to inſtruct after the deſtruction of the city, until he ceaſed to live; during the captivity Ezekiel and Daniel inſtructed the people, and after it Nehemias, Eſdras, &c. Independent on the extraordinary miniſtry of the prophets the ordinary miniſtry of the prieſthood, commenced in Aaron, never ceaſed until the final ceſſation of the Jewiſh church; of this truth the ſcripture affords the moſt convincing evidence. The prophet Ezekiel clearly diſtinguiſhes prieſts, who had ſwerved from their duty, from the venerable paſtors, who had been at all times faithful to their miniſtry: "but the Levites, who went far from me, when Iſrael ſtrayed, when they ſtrayed from me after their idols, they ſhall bear their iniquity..... they ſhall not approach me to do the office of prieſt for me.... but the prieſts, the Levites, the ſons of Sadoc, who preſerved the miniſtry '*aſher ſhomrou eth miſhmareth mikadſhi*,' of my ſanctuary when the ſons of Iſrael ſtrayed from me, they ſhall approach to me to miniſter to me; they ſhall ſtand before me to offer to me the fat and the blood, ſaith the Lord Jehovah. They ſhall come into my ſanctuary, they ſhall approach to my table to miniſter to me, and they ſhall preſerve my miniſtry," Ezekiel, xliv, 10. We know that Sadoc was high prieſt in Solomon's days, and God atteſts by his prophet that his deſcendants did not ſtray nor ſwerve from their duty, and that they ſhould continue in their miniſtry to ſerve him. The covenant of the prieſthood with Phineas ſon to Eleazar, ſon to Aaron, was not diſcontinued until the prieſthood was transferred: "the

Lord

Lord ſaid to Moſes, Phineas ſon of Eleazar, ſon to Aaron the prieſt, has averted my wrath from the Children of Iſrael . . . . . wherefore, ſay: behold I give him my covenant of peace and it ſhall be *to him and to his ſeed after him the covenant of an everlaſting prieſthood*, becauſe that he was zealous for his God and made an atonement for the Children of Iſrael,"—Num. xxv, 12, 13. That this prieſthood, in virtue of the covenant, did continue without interruption until the final ceſſation of the Moſaic diſpenſation we know from St. Paul: in his epiſtle to the Hebrews the apoſtle ſhews the total ceſſation of the Moſaic law from the change of the prieſthood; the prieſthood therefore muſt have continued until the final ceſſation of the Jewiſh church: for if it had ceaſed at any time before, the law would have ceaſed with it. The initiating ceremony of circumciſion, and the other Moſaic ceremonies are not ſaid to have ceaſed at any time: the pious Jew could always find a miniſter of the Jewiſh church to perform all the rites and ceremonies, which the law required of him. Even during the captivity their prophets and prieſts inſtructed; and ſo religiouſly attentive were they to the Divine inſtitution, which confined the prieſthood to the family of Aaron, that the prieſts, the ſons Habaiah, who had aſſumed the name of Barzallai, from their mother, unable to prove their genealogy from the authentic regiſter, were excluded from the miniſtry, Nehemiah, vii, 63. The paſſage which he cites from 2d Chronicles, xv, 3, applies not to the Jewiſh church, which was never without a teaching prieſt of the deſcendants of Aaron, but to the Jewiſh people in their preſent ſtate, who have been ſince the ceſſation of the Moſaic diſpenſation without prophet or prieſt, and will continue in the ſame ſtate until the *fulneſs of the Gentiles be come in*, Rom. xi. 25.

The caſtigator's ſpirit of divination, like that ſpirit of illuſion, which blinds the Jews, diſcovers in the prophet's words, not the prediction of a future event, but the relationof a paſt calamity; he fits the paſſage to his

purpoſe

purpose by substituting his own words to these of the prophet: "Israel were without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without the law," so says the castigator. The prophet says: "*yejemim rabim leisrael 'lelo Elohei emeth velelo Cohen moreh vulelo thorah.*" "many days to Israel, to no God of truth, to no teaching priest, to no law." That this is a prediction of a future event is manifest from what the prophet adds: "in them times no peace to the man going out, or to the man coming in, but many terrors over all the inhabitants of the whole earth." These words have a clear reference to the consummation. It is thus described by all the prophets who speak of that event.

It is therefore unquestionably true that the Jewish church in its deepest affliction and greatest obscurity was perfectly visible, and its ministry without interruption; if this be true of the Mosaic dispensation, which was from its constitution, terminable, the cessation of which had been so repeatedly announced by the prophets, how much more certain is it of the Christian church, which is from its constitution interminable? The castigator asks: if the Romish church was as visible during the ten persecutions as at the Council of Constance? He thus inadvertently informs his readers, that the Romish church, as he calls it, is that church which was founded by the apostles, which was persecuted by the Neros, the Domitiens, &c. in the faith of which all the martyrs spilled their blood. It is therefore the church to which the promises were made; that church against which the gates of hell will not prevail: he did not advert to these consequences. To his query, the writer replies Yes. The persecutions prove it: they were not exercised on an invisible church: the persecutors knew where to find the most distinguished pastors; they were the first objects of persecuting rage, and it was not confined to them. The church was never more conspicuous than when its faith was professed by its ministers and their disciples in the face of the world, in the presence of persecuting emperors,

emperors their officers and executioners. What could induce the man to think the church inviſible at ſuch a time? It was this ſame Romiſh church inviſible, as he dreams, during the ten perſecutions, which was perfectly viſible in the council of Conſtance in 1414. He admits therefore that it had enjoyed until that period an uninterrupted exiſtence; but it was not more viſible in the council of Conſtance in 1414, than it was in the Council of Trent, 1545; nor was it more viſible then, than it is now in 1809. It is therefore, and caſtigator injudiciouſly acknowledges it, the only church, which has enjoyed an uninterrupted exiſtence ſince the apoſtles' days; if it be not the church of Chriſt, the redeemer never had a church on earth, and chriſtianity is but an illuſion.

Both Proteſtants and catholics he believes, maintain that the appearance of antichriſt is connected with a general apoſtacy. The writer does not inquire what proteſtants maintain, but catholics maintain no ſuch doctrine, catholics do not confound doctrines and opinions, the terms are not ſynonymous in their language: it is the opinion of ſome catholics that immediately previous to, or on the appearance of antichriſt, there will be a great apoſtacy, that all the wicked will publicly diſclaim the faith of Jeſus Chriſt, and unite with that impoſtor. They found their opinion on the words of St. Paul, 2 Theſ. ii. He ſays that the day of the Lord will not come until there be a revolt, and the ſon of perdition be revealed; others with equal, if not greater reaſon, think the defection, foretold by the apoſtle, a revolt of the dependant provinces againſt the Roman empire, of which St. Paul, ſpeaks covertly to avoid giving offence to the then maſters of the world, who believed their empire eternal; and many think that St. Paul, uſed the abſtract term *apoſtacy* to ſignify antichriſt the great *apoſtate*, a mode of ſpeaking in common uſe with ſacred and prophane writers. Thus Roboam is called not a fool, but the folly of the nation, Eccl. xlvii. 27; but whatever their opinions may be with reſpect to this predic-

tion, no catholic ever believed that this laſt apoſtacy could in any ſenſe affect the viſibility or the ſtability of the church : is it an inviſible church that antichriſt will perſecute with ſuch relentleſs fury ? Was it an inviſible church that Paul himſelf perſecuted ? Is it an inviſible church to which the Jews will be converted by the preaching of the two witneſſes ? If the church of Jeſus Chriſt be extinct on the laſt day in what church will the angels find his elect, whom they will collect from the four winds at the ſound of the trumpet ?---Matt. xxiv, 31. In what church will they be found who overcome the beaſt, and his image, and the number of his name ? Apo. xv, 2. Is it in an inviſible church, by inviſible miniſters that the faith will be announced, baptiſm and the euchariſt adminiſtered ? Theſe rites will continue until the conſummation, or Chriſt and his apoſtle have deceived us : The ſaviour ſaid to his apoſtles : going make diſciples of all nations, baptiſing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, teaching them to keep all things whatſoever, which I have commanded you ; and *behold I am with you all days until the conſummation of the world.*—Matt. xxiv. With this expreſs promiſe of the Saviour to be with his miniſters teaching and baptiſing until time ſhall be no more, the evangeliſt cloſes his hiſtory : and St. Paul, in terms equally expreſſive, ſays that by the euchariſt the death of the Lord will be announced until he comes at the end of time to judge the world ; the faith cannot be announced, nor theſe rites adminiſtered by inviſible miniſters, in an inviſible church. The ſuppoſition is ſo extravagant, ſo offenſive to common ſenſe, that it is matter of ſurpriſe that any man, however infatuated by error or blinded by prejudice, can prevail on himſelf to believe it.

This caſtigator, whoſe liberality knows no bounds, lends his words to the inſpired writers, and his opinion to the Redeemer. Chriſt, to enforce the neceſſity of inceſſant prayer, one of theſe unprofitable auſterities, from which the reformation relieved its miniſters, ſays of a wicked

wicked judge, that though he neither feared God, nor regarded man, yet to free himself from the importunity of a widow, he resolved to avenge her of her adversary. —Luke xviii. He then asks: "Will not God avenge his elect, who cry unto him night and day, though he bear long with them?" To this question he himself replies: "I say unto you that he will avenge them speedily." He then asks another question: "Nevertheless, when the Son of Man cometh will he find faith on earth?" He asks the opinion of his disciples, who made no reply; nor did he himself: he did not say there will, or there will not. Who could imagine, if the castigator's spirit of divination had not discovered it, that the Saviour intended to reply: there will be no faith on earth, but forgot it, or the evangelist forgot to insert it? However, without consulting this spirit of divination, we find a sufficient reply to this question in more passages than one. The elect, whom the angels will collect at the sound of the trumpet from the four winds, that is, from all parts of the earth, will they have no faith? These myriads, who will overcome the beast, his image, and the number of his name, will they have no faith? Is it not of his last coming the Saviour speaks—Luke xxi, 27: "then will they see the Son of Man coming on a cloud with power and great glory?" To whom does he say: "when you see these things beginning to come to pass, then rise up, lift up your heads, for your redemption is near?" Will these have no faith? The mystery of the eucharist, by which the death of the Lord will be announced until he comes—2 Cor. will it cease before he comes? Or will it be administered by invisible ministers to an invisible people in an invisible church? It is irksome to be obliged to refute such nonsense. However, in vindication of this castigator, it must be admitted, that he has faithfully transcribed all the reasons, which his ancestors, the prime reformers, and their panegyrists, have offered to justify their separation; he has only forgotten to inform his readers that they have been

been refuted an hundred times before he was born. This inceſſant repetition of the ſame hackneyed arguments argues an inſuperable obſtinacy accompanied by a barrenneſs of invention, which excites both contempt and diſguſt. He garbles an extract from Ockham and Panormiton, which ſerve to fill his pamphlet, the extracts only ſhew that the writers were ignorant or inaccurate, as their authority is of no weight, the writer does not inquire whether the paſſages adduced be genuine or not; he is not diſpoſed to juſtify the miſtakes or inaccuracies of all catholic writers, they have the modeſty, to ſubmit their opinions to the judgment of their ſuperiors. If this caſtigator wiſhes to oblige the public with propoſitions extracted from the writings of catholics and condemned, he may find wherewith to fill a folio volume.

In his next chapter he admits that the church of Chriſt is catholic or univerſal; but he thinks this characteriſtic does not belong to the Romiſh church. He does not ſeem inclined to diſpute the univerſality of time. The fact is indiſputable: that the Romiſh church did commence in the apoſtle's days, and continues yet, is a fact of ſuch unqueſtionable notoriety, that the man would be thought fit for bedlam, who would venture to diſpute it. He has not told us when this laſt and beſt reformed church, of which he is himſelf either the founder, or the miniſter, commenced; nor has he told us in what part of the world it lay concealed, either viſible or inviſible, even ſince Luther's reformation; before that period, if he pretends that it had an exiſtence at all, not one proteſtant of common information will believe him. If the church of Chriſt be catholic, the church of which he is miniſter is not the church of Chriſt. The antecedent he has admitted; to deny the conſequent argues ſomething worſe than ignorance. Though he does not diſpute the univerſality of time, he thinks the univerſality of place may afford a ſubterfuge: "Have," ſays he, p. 148, "her tenets been propagated in every nation on earth?" Perhaps the authority of St. Paul may ſatisfy him: "Firſt then,

then, says the apostle, writing to this Romish Church, I thank my God for you all; because *your faith, é pistis ūmōn*, is announced in the whole world.—Rom. i. 8. The Romish church was therefore catholic in the apostle's days, will the castigator inform us when it ceased to be catholic? What nation is there, in which her tenets have not been preached? If there be any such, which the writer very much doubts, her faith will yet be propagated there: the consummation of the world is the limit prescribed by the saviour to the propagation of the faith of his church, see remarks p. 135..... the writer's reasoning on the subject is refuted by silence, it seems that this castigator's spirit of divination could discover no evasion. It is true he says, because the man must say something, that a little reflection would have shewn this writer that many of the passages by which he attempts, to illustrate this point are applicable only to these days when "the whole earth will be filled with the glory of the Lord." There are days therefore in his opinion in which the earth is not filled with the glory of the Lord, how sadly the angels were deceived whom Isaias heard crying out incessantly "the whole earth is full of the glory of the Lord."—Isaias vi. 3. And David was not less mistaken when he said: "the Heavens announce the glory of the Lord, and the firmament declares the work of his hands.—Ps. xix. 1.

Our castigator begins this chapter by saying "protestants, as well as papists, are persuaded that the church of Christ is catholic or universal;" and ends it by saying "that this universality can be no characteristic of the church of Christ in her present situation." From these two propositions, contradicting each the other, and advanced almost in the same breath, we conclude with unerring certainty that consistency is no characteristic of this castigator. A man reduced to such straits is an object of pity, he felt the impossibility of applying this universality to his new modelled church, and wisely concluded that though protestants do believe the church

universal, universality is not a characteristic of the church of Christ. Thus, though he calls himself a protestant, he new models the protestant creed, and fits it to his own conventicle. He will scarcely venture to deny that the church of Christ was believed to be catholic or universal in the first ages of christianity, that catholicity or universality was then thought to be a characteristic of Christ's church; this is one of these notes of Christ's church, which is expressly marked in all the professions of faith, which we have upon record. Will he then condescend to inform us if the Romish church be not catholic or universal, what other church is, or ever was? When was it that the Romish church arrogated to herself the title of catholic, and protestants began to distinguish Romanists from others by calling them catholics? Can his spirit of divination discover the time when we who call ourselves catholics were called protestants, or were distinguished by any other name? And they who call themselves now protestants, were called catholics and were distinguished from us by that appellation? In what time, by what means, by what magic has this change been effected? Though these embarrassing questions admit no solution, the writer proposes one extremely simple: Has this castigator ever in his serious moments prevailed on himself to believe that, that little conventicle, of which he is a pastor, whether by the election of the people nominated, or instituted by some ceremony, of which the writer knows nothing, is the church of Jesus Christ, founded by the apostles, to which the promises were made? Has it crossed his imagination even in his dreams, that all the elect of Jesus Christ have been sanctified within the pale of his little conventicle? Has this immense crowd, of whom St. John speaks, Rev. vii, 9, been sanctified in the communion of his new little church? Does it embrace all nations, tribes, peoples and tongues? Thus the apostle describes the elect: "I saw and behold a great crowd whom no one could number, of all nations and tribes,

tribes, and peoples, and tongues, ſtanding before the Lamb." What does the caſtigator think of this paſſage? Is it in the church of Jeſus Chriſt that all theſe millions of millions are ſanctified or is it not? If it be, which even preſumption will not venture to deny, the church of Jeſus Chriſt is therefore the church of all nations, of all tribes and tongues, it is conſequently univerſal. The Caſtigator may not believe it; and as it is abſolutely impoſſible that this multitude without number ſhould be ſanctified and perfected in any church, which is not univerſal both in time and place, hence follows another conſequence of the moſt ſerious import to this caſtigator, and his deluded friends, that is, that his new modelled church, in which all nations and tongues are not found, is not the Church of Jeſus Chriſt.

From the catholicity of the church, which the caſtigator admits in one page and denies in the next, he paſſes to the doctrine of infallibility. This doctrine the writer had ſhewn to be a neceſſary conſequence of the churches' indefectibility, of which proteſtants are as ſtrenuous ſupporters as the Romiſh church, ſays our caſtigator p. 133, for if it be true that the exiſtence of the church cannot be interrupted, it is therefore true that ſhe cannot teach falſe doctrine, for if ſhe be ſuppoſed to teach falſe doctrine at any time, ſhe at that time is not the Houſe of God, the *Pillar and Ground of Truth*, as St. Paul ſays, 2d. Tim. iii. 15, but the pillar and ground of falſehood, ſhe therefore at that time is not the church of Jeſus Chriſt, but the ſynagogue of Satan, her exiſtence is interrupted, and inſtead of being indefectible, ſhe has failed, and the gates of Hell have prevailed againſt her, notwithſtanding the promiſe of Jeſus Chriſt. Hence it is manifeſt to the meaneſt capacity that her indefectibility once eſtabliſhed, her infallibility follows indiſputably. The caſtigator does not even attempt to invalidate the writer's reaſoning on this ſubject; of that he felt the impoſſibility, but to divert the attention of his readers, and fill his pamphlet with ſomething, he tranſcribes ſome

ſome fragments from the Councils of Conſtance and Baſil, in which the authority of the Council is declared ſuperior to that of the Pope, and their deciſions of infallible authority; and in oppoſition to theſe he cites ſome garbled paſſages from Catholic writers, who think the pontifical authority ſuperior to that of any Council not authoriſed by the pope; fragments from the Alcoran would have been as much to the purpoſe: for whether the deciſion of a Council aſſembled by the papal authority and continued in oppoſition to his injunctions, be of infallible authority, as the prelates in Baſil pretended, or not, as many believe; and whether the pontifical approbation be neceſſary to authoriſe the decrees of Councils or not, it is not the leſs certain, nor the leſs univerſally and invariably believed by all Catholics, that the doctrinal deciſions of the paſtors of the church, united with their head, is of infallible authority, and on this truth there is not, nor ever was, a ſhadow of diverſity of opinion amongſt Catholics, as the writer had aſſerted in his Remarks. For if it be true, as ſome pretend, that the deciſion of a Council of Biſhops, whether authoriſed by the pope or not, be of infallible authority, it is not the leſs true that their deciſion authoriſed by the pontiff's judgment is infallible; and if it be true, as others ſay, that a doctrinal deciſion of the pope accompanied by the conditions, which they require, be infallible, it is at leaſt equally true, and more certain, that this deciſion authoriſed by the judgment of the Council is infallible. On this doctrine there is no diſagreement, no variation. This then is the term of communion; that doctrine which is believed by all Catholics, in all places, and at all times; a doctrine ſo conſiſtent with the plan of Chriſtianity, that Proteſtants have admitted it: the learned Doctor Bull, in his defence of the faith of the Council of Nice, ſays: "in that council a principal article of the chriſtian religion was in diſpute, if in a queſtion of that importance it be imagined that all the paſtors of the church could fall into error, and deceive

all

all the faithful, how can the word of Jesus Christ be defended, who promised to his apostles, and to their successors, to be always with them? The promise would not be true: because the apostles were not to live a long time, were it not that their successors were comprised in the persons of the apostles themselves. Bull. *Def. fid. præm.* N. 2, p. 2., To prove that this was the doctrine then taught in the church, this learned protestant cites a passage from the historian Socrates, L. vi, C. 9, "though the fathers of that council were simple and not very learned, they could not fall into error because they were enlightened by the light of the Holy Ghost," this is the doctrine of Doctor Bull, the doctrine which is naturally impressed on the mind by the promise of Jesus Christ, to be always with the pastors of his church, teaching and baptising, and also to send the Holy Ghost to teach them all truth.—John xvi, 13. This in the most limited sense must be understood of all truth necessary to salvation.

Our castigator after having filled a couple of pages with these extracts, which whether genuine or not the writer believes him to have faithfully transcribed from his repertory, because he has seen them more than once before, inquires, with that politeness which is peculiar to himself, how the simple faithful may know whether Popes or Councils are the greatest liars, p. 151. To this the writer replies, that his better half and his favourite maid, may learn from him, with as much ease and certainty, as he himself has learned from his familiar spirit, which exhibits a strong resemblance to that of the delphic Pythoness. The writer inserts a supposed dialogue between the mistress and the maid consequent to one of the castigator's lectures.

J. Lord mistress! What a wonderful man is master? To be sure these wicked popes and popish bishops, are all liars. Master says so.

M. Ay! ay! Jane! My good man knows that: my good man reads the bible.

J. The bible, miſtreſs! Does the bible ſay that all theſe wicked popes and biſhops are liars?

M. Ay! ay! Jane! The bible ſays that the Phariſees were liars, to be ſure the popes and biſhops are the Phariſees. Do not you know that?

J. To be ſure miſtreſs! They are the Phariſees: maſter ſays ſo. Bleſs the man of God! He ſays that I know every thing in the bible, to be ſure miſtreſs knows every thing that maſter knows; but I did not think that I knew every thing in the bible myſelf until maſter told me ſo.

M. Ay! ay! Jane! you muſt believe nothing but what is in the bible.

J. To be ſure miſtreſs, I muſt believe nothing but what maſter tells me. Does not the bible ſay that? Bleſſings on the good book, which tells maſter that I know every thing in it; that I underſtand it better than all theſe wicked popes, and popiſh biſhops, who pretend that I do not underſtand it. Is it not that great book with the fine pictures? How edifying to ſee that fine young man and that pretty young woman naked under the tree? But miſtreſs, are not images idols? Maſter ſays ſo.

This dialogue, which, though ſuppoſed, is not the leſs natural, ſenſibly expoſes the artifice of this caſtigator and his fellow reformiſts, who under pretence of recalling the people from ſuppoſed errors taught by their lawful paſtors, to the authority of the ſcriptures, give their infatuated followers their own opinions regardleſs of the ſcriptures. There is now before the writer a verſion of the old and new teſtament by Doctor Southwell, ſwelled to an enormous bulk, by his notes and comments; in theſe notes and comments, ſome of which are not only falſe, but extravagant even to folly, a deluded multitude think they find the genuine ſenſe of the ſcriptures, whilſt they find in reality but the ravings of this fanatic, which he has ſubſtituted to the ſenſe intended by the inſpired writers. Thus for inſtance in his note on the vii. to the Hebrews, he ſays: "it is allowed that Abraham

was

was called from among idolators at a time when none were left to keep up the worſhip of the true God in its purity;" this is a wild conjecture which has no foundation in ſcripture: it argues the ignorance of this voluminous commentator: the patriarch Sem, who was never ſuſpected of idolatry was yet living: for he lived 500 years after the flood.—Gen. xi, ii. And Abraham tenth, in ſucceſſion to that patriarch, was born about 382 years after the flood, his ſon Iſaac 99 years after, ſo that Iſaac was 19 years old at the death of Sem. This ignorant commentator gravely tells his readers that during the life time of this venerable patriarch, the founder of ſo great a portion of the human race, there were none to keep the worſhip of the true God in its purity! But if this be a wild conjecture the ſequel of the note contains a blaſphemous aſſertion, that is, "that Melchiſedeck was no other than the redeemer of mankind," thus, with one daſh of his pen, he annihilates the divinity of Jeſus Chriſt, reducing him to the rank of prieſt before his incarnation, for Moſes ſays, that Melchiſedeck "was prieſt to the moſt high God"—*Ve hou cohen le ēl heliōn.*—Gen. xiv, 18.

If the partner of his paſtoral cares and her maid may learn with ſomuch eaſe to determine whether popes or councils be the greateſt liars, the writer tranſcribes a ſimple rule of great antiquity and reſpectable authority, by which others not ſo well informed as his *cara ſpoſa* may determine with equal eaſe and infallible certainty whether this caſtigator himſelf be a child of truth, or its oppoſite: St. Paul, in his epiſtle to the Romans, x, ſays, "for whoſoever ſhall call upon the name of the Lord ſhall be ſaved. How then ſhall they call on him, in whom they have not believed? And how ſhall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard? And how ſhall they hear without a preacher? And how ſhall they preach except they be ſent?" By what authority was this caſtigator, paſtor of a nameleſs church, ſent to preach? This queſtion is extremely ſimple, however embarraſſing it may appear. The

apoſtle

apoſtle ſays, the preacher muſt be ſent; that is an infallible truth if the ſcriptures be infallible. No man ſends himſelf; that is an intuitive truth, which bears no contradiction, the man, who ſends the preacher muſt himſelf poſſeſs the authority to preach: for no man can communicate to another the authority which he himſelf has not. It is an axiom that no man can give what he has not, hence it follows of all neceſſity that this authority to preach muſt deſcend from Jeſus Chriſt, through his apoſtles, whom he ſent to preach, in a regular and uninterrupted ſucceſſion—againſt this reaſoning it is madneſs to contend. This rule of the apoſtle, infallibly true and extremely ſimple in its application, ſhews with the moſt exact preciſion and unerring certainty whether this our Edinburgh caſtigator be a child of truth, or one of theſe emiſſaries of whom the Lord ſaid by his prophet, Jeremiah, xiv, 14: "They prophecy falſely in my name: I did not ſend them nor command them, nor did I ſpeak to them; it is a lying viſion, and divination, the fraud and ſeduction of their hearts, which they prophecy;" and xxiii, 21: "I did not ſend theſe prophets, and they ran; I did not ſpeak to them, and they propheſied." That theſe emiſſaries, who ran without being ſent were not excluſively confined to the moſaic diſpenſation we know, from St. Paul, 1ſt, to Tim. i. He ſays: that ſome had ſwerved from charity and faith, "deſiring to be teachers of the law; underſtanding neither what they ſay, nor whereof they affirm," and in his 2d to Tim. iv. He foretells an abuſe of which antiquity knew nothing, that is, the uſurpation of the miniſtry, by the people: "for the time will come when they will not endure ſound doctrine, but after their own luſts will heap to themſelves teachers, having itching ears"—this may ſerve as a corrective to the exuberance of the caſtigator's bile. The writer now adds, that whether theſe popes and biſhops be *great liars* or not, they are the rightful ſucceſſors of the apoſtles, that to them, through their predeceſſors, the authority of preaching and teaching, veſted in his

apoſtles

apoſtles by Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, is regularly deſcended in due ſucceſſion; that of them not one ſends himſelf; not one preſumes to uſurp the miniſtry as Knox, that arch-impoſtor did, and as many others do; not one receives his miſſion but from thoſe, who have themſelves been inſtituted according to the Divine ordination; this is a fact of ſuch unqueſtionable notoriety that no proteſtant of common ſenſe ever denied it; of ſuch impreſſive evidence that the church of England, the only proteſtant church, which has retained an appearance of the ancient church, proves, or at leaſt endeavours to prove, her miſſion from theſe popes and popiſh biſhops. Hence the writer concludes that theſe popes and biſhops, though they may not obtain the approbation of the caſtigator, are notwithſtanding the paſtors, whom Jeſus Chriſt now gives to his church, for the perfection of his elect. As this concluſion directly excludes the pretenſions of this Edinburgh caſtigator, and reduces him to that level, from which, by his private authority, or by ſome pretended authority of the ſame nature, and conſequently not greater than his own, he has raiſed himſelf, he may not perhaps ſo willingly admit it, but whether he admits or diſputes it, it is not the leſs certain. St. Paul, whoſe authority is of ſome weight, expreſsly authorizes it: in his epiſtle to the Epheſians, iv, the apoſtle ſays: "and he, (Jeſus Chriſt) gave ſome apoſtles, and ſome prophets, and ſome evangeliſts, and ſome *paſtors and teachers, for the perfecting of the ſaints, for the work of the miniſtry, for the edifying of the body of Chriſt, until we all come in the unity of the faith*, and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the meaſure of the nature of the fulneſs of Chriſt, that we be no more children toſſed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the craft (in the original *kubeia*, that is, dice play) of men, by the ſhuffling to the *methodiſm* of error." The writer tranſlates *methodeian' methodiſm*, becauſe he thinks the terms convey the ſame idea. In its common acceptation, it ſignifies '*circumvention*, or *impoſture*. Either then the apoſtle has

deceived

deceived us, or Chriſt gives, and will continue to give *paſtors and teachers for* the perfecting of the ſaints, and the work of the miniſtry and the edifying of the body of Chriſt, until all the members of his myſtical body are perfected, that is until time ſhall be no more: for the Saviour expreſsly ſays—Matt. xiii, 30: "Let both grow together until the harveſt, and in the time of harveſt I will ſay to the reapers: gather ye together firſt the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them, but gather the wheat into my barn;" and in the ſame chapter he himſelf explains the parable, v, 37 . . . . "He that ſoweth the good ſeed is the Son of Man; the field is the world; the good ſeed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy, that ſowed them is the devil; the harveſt is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels." In words as clearly expreſſive as language affords, the Saviour tells us that his elect, the children of his kingdom, until the end of time will be in the world intermixed with the children of the prince of darkneſs; until that period therefore he will continue to give paſtors and teachers for the perfecting of his elect, for the work of the miniſtry. St. Paul atteſts it; reaſon atteſts, and nothing but perverſe obſtinacy can deny it, that theſe paſtors and teachers, whom Chriſt gives for the perfecting of the ſaints for the work of the miniſtry, are they only, to whom the authority of feeding and teaching his flock veſted by Jeſus Chriſt in his apoſtles deſcends in regular and uninterrupted ſucceſſion; what does the caſtigator think of this reaſoning? Scurrilous invectives againſt popes and councils will not invalidate concluſive argument, theſe invectives juſtify the neceſſity of a regular ſucceſſion of paſtors of Chriſt's appointment, to enſure his diſciples againſt the artifice of impoſtors who intrude themſelves; to be led aſtray by their opinions and inventions the apoſtle with great energy calls being toſſed to and fro, and whirled about with every wind of doctrine. To ſet this truth in a

ſtronger

ſtronger light if poſſible, the writer contraſts the injunctions of Jeſus Chriſt and his apoſtle to the faithful with the advice which this Edinburgh caſtigator gives. Chriſt ſays, Matt. xviii, 17: "if any man will not hear the church let him be to you as a heathen or a publican." The church ſpeaks by its paſtors, as the ſtate by its officers. The caſtigator, in direct oppoſition to the injunction of Jeſus Chriſt, ſays to the ſimple faithful: "believe them not." St. Paul ſays, Hebrews xiii, 17: "obey your guides and be ſubject to them for they watch over your ſouls, as obliged to account *for them.*" The caſtigator ſays: "follow your own direction, and believe them not." After this ſhort digreſſion, which the indecent invectives or rather ſcurrilous abuſe laviſhed on popes and biſhops by an obſcure individual, who has yet to ſtudy the firſt elements of ſcience, extorted, the writer proceeds to diſcuſs the hackneyed ſubterfuges, which the caſtigator has tranſcribed from his repertory, to elude or rather to embarraſs a truth which cannot be eluded. Deſpair alone ſuggeſts the firſt. "Is it not reaſoning in a circle to ſay that infallibility proves the inſpiration of the ſcriptures and then the ſcriptures prove the infallibility?" p. 152. Does this caſtigator believe the ſcriptures divinely inſpired? Or does he not? If he does, they may be aſſumed as principles admitted on both ſides. If he does not believe them divinely inſpired, catholics are not embarraſſed to prove the chriſtian religion true, and the ſcriptures divinely inſpired, againſt atheiſts and deiſts—ſee a Treatiſe on the firſt principles of Chriſtianity, in which that queſtion is diſcuſſed, and the ſophiſms of atheiſts and deiſts examined. This caſtigator does not ſeem to know, what logicians underſtand by a vicious circle in argument. When of two things equally uncertain the one is aſſumed as a certain principle to prove the other. This is a vicious circle. Does this caſtigator pretend that a principle, admitted by both parties as certain and infallibly true, is an uncertain principle? Againſt ſuch nonſenſe there is no reaſoning.

After

After his firſt aukward attempt to throw a ſhade over a truth, which blinds him, this indefatigable tranſcriber fills a page with a citation from *the Remarks*, in which the words of Chriſt, enjoining obedience to his church are cited, and the conduct of the framers of the thirty nine articles of Elizabeth's creed is ſtated as inconſiſtent with this injunction. To this the caſtigator replies: "that the framers of the thirty-nine articles were ignorant of any precept, which obliged them to follow the direction of the church implicitly." If ſo they were ignorant of the ſcriptures, as is this caſtigator: for there is not a precept in the decalogue more expreſsly announced than that of Jeſus Chriſt, Matt. xviii. 17: "if any man will not hear the Church let him be to you as a Heathen or a publican." Though the framers of the thirty-nine articles knew no precept, which obliged themſelves to obey the church of Chriſt's inſtitution, they ſeemed to know ſomething of a precept, which obliges Engliſhmen to obey the church of Elizabeth's inſtitution. Are not the miniſters of the church of England obliged to ſubſcribe the thirty-nine articles? Are not the ſtudents in the univerſities obliged to ſubſcribe them before they have learned to examine them? Is this order conſiſtent with that fundamental principle: the ſcriptures are a ſole and ſufficient rule of faith? In what book of the ſcriptures did they find that Elizabeth was head of the church? Where is it ſaid that a woman is a miniſter of the church at all? The power of Parliament is great, that is admitted; it can do every thing that is naturally poſſible; ſo ſays Blackſtone; but it cannot make a woman a man; and conſequently could not make the queen a miniſter of Chriſt's church, much leſs could they make her the chief miniſter of it. "They had read ſomewhere," ſays the caſtigator, "to the law and the teſtimony; if they ſpeak not according to this word, it is becauſe there is no light in them," Iſaias viii, 20. Is it contrary to the law for the people to obey their paſtors? If this caſtigator's ſpirit of divination had

had not discovered it, who would imagine, that obedience to the pastors of the church, so strictly and repeatedly enjoined, both in the old and new law, is contrary to the law? We read somewhere that a doubtful question in controversy was to be referred to the Priests, the Levites, and the Judge, whose decision was final; and that simple man, Moses, who had not an Edinburgh castigator in his Council, instead of directing the contending parties to examine the decision of the Priests, to determine if it was founded in the law, says, without any restriction: "And thou shalt do according to the sentence, which they shall pronounce from the place which the Lord shall choose; thou shalt not decline from the sentence, which they will pronounce to thee, to the right hand nor to the left; and that man who will act in pride, and will not hearken to the Priest, who will then stand to minister there, to the Lord thy God, and to the Judge, that man shall die, and thou shalt remove that evil from Israel, and all the people shall hear, and fear, and not act in pride in future," Deut. xvii, 11, 12. Has his spirit of divination discovered in what stage, of the Mosaic dispensation, this injunction of that legislator ceased to oblige? When was it that individuals were authorised to examine the decision of the high Priest and his Council? The prophet Isaias called the people to the observance of the law, of which obedience to their pastors was an indispensible precept; he warned them against the insidious artifices of impostors—"When they say unto you: enquire of familiar spirits *(oboth)* and of soothsayers, who peep and who mutter. Should not the people enquire of their God? Shall they enquire of the living from the dead? To the law and the testimony; if they do not speak according to this word the morning light is not for them—*ein lehem Shachar*—Is. viii, 20. The prophet forbids the people to consult familiar spirits (the original term *oboth* may signify *Ventriloquists*) or soothsayers, who peep—"*hajidehonim hametsaptsephim*"—that is, who inspect the entrails of beasts or birds which

was forbidden under penalty of death by the law, he shews the folly of consulting carcases or inanimate idols on future events, of which they know nothing, directs the people to observe the law, and on future events to have recourse to the ark of the testimony, which was placed under the mercy seat from which the Divine oracles were given."—Exod. xxv, 21. He then concludes with a terrible menace, that if they did not observe this injunction, the morning light, by which prosperity is signified in the prophetic style, is not for them. In this passage the castigator's *oboth* has discovered that Isaias directed the Jews to examine the doctrine of their pastors, and if their pastors did not teach according to the law, to disregard them. He forgot to tell us by what authority these ventriloquists and soothsayers were appointed pastors of the Jewish church, or teachers of that people; men who are duped by such imposture are scarcely deserving of pity.

In the next paragraph, p. 154, the castigator cites these words from the writer's Remarks: "our Saviour said without reserve or restriction: if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as a Heathen." To this he replies: "the apostle Paul also says with as little reserve or restriction: 'put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates,' yet both the primitive Christians and protestant heretics, whom they have murdered in myriads, can attest their want of infallibility." To extract something like argument from this jumble of words, and ideas it must be: as the Heathen magistrates to whom Paul enjoined obedience were not infallible, so the pastors of Christ's church, to whom Christ in the same manner enjoined obedience, are not infallible. The writer was yet to learn that the obedience to the magistrates and the ministers of the state, which the apostle ordered, was of the same nature with the obedience to the pastors and teachers of his church enjoined by Christ. He like other simple men, who have no familiar spirit to consult,

conſult, thought the obedience of which the apoſtle ſpeaks confined to civil duties, and the obedience enjoined by the Saviour to be of a religious nature; he had not yet learned to believe that Chriſt had conſtituted the miniſters and magiſtrates of the ſtate, paſtors and teachers of his church; or that he had made the paſtors and teachers of his church miniſters and magiſtrates of the ſtate. The world is indebted to this Edinburgh caſtigator's *ob.* for two great diſcoveries: that the ventriloquiſts and ſoothſayers were the paſtors of the Jewiſh church, and that the Heathen magiſtrates were the firſt paſtors of the Chriſtian church.

He fills a few pages with invectives againſt the Phariſees and popes, whom he claſſes together and piouſly conſigns to the ſpirit of darkneſs, with whom he ſeems to have almoſt as great an intimacy as his anceſtor Martin; he tells us, what we know, that the Saviour warned his diſciples againſt the hypocriſy of the Phariſees, from whence his readers muſt conclude, that Chriſt warned the faithful againſt the hypocriſy of popes and popiſh biſhops. If he had not informed us, we ſhould not have known that Chriſt had warned his diſciples againſt the hypocriſy of the paſtors of his own inſtitution: for after all, theſe popes and popiſh biſhops, were the firſt paſtors, and the ſole paſtors of Chriſt's church, many centuries before the new modelled church of this caſtigating paſtor was known. As he has been ſo complaiſant to us, he muſt not be ſurpriſed at a piece of information, which we give him, that is, that Chriſt did warn the faithful againſt the hypocriſy not of the paſtors of *his own choice*, but of the paſtors of *their own choice*, or of the choice of others not authoriſed by him. Theſe he, with great propriety calls wolves in ſheep's clothing: "beware," ſaid he, "of falſe prophets, who come to you in ſheep's clothing; but inwardly they are ravening wolves."—Matt. vii, 15. Has this caſtigator, in his ſerious moments, ever beſtowed a ſerious thought on this warning? In all theſe invectives the writer can find nothing like argument:

argument: he has not cited one unfounded decision of the pastors of the Jewish Church, before their decision against Christ himself, which was clearly predicted, and by which it ceased to be a Church.

From his repertory he transcribes a few lines from a passage in Jerom's works, to which, as usual, he affixes a sense as opposite to the sense intended by that father, as falsehood is to truth: the writer transcribes the whole passage, not from Illyricus's *Catalogue of Witnesses*, this castigator's repertory, but from Jerom's work now open before him: "Then Jesus said to the multitudes and to the disciples; the scribes and Pharisees sit on the chair of Moses, therefore all things whatsoever they say unto you to keep; keep and do them, but according to their works do not do,"—Matt. xxiii, 1. On this passage Jerom says: "What more mild, what more gentle than the Lord? He is tempted by the Pharisees; their artifices are confounded, and their toils, according to the psalmist, are the arrows of children, nevertheless, for the dignity of the priesthood, and of the name, he exhorts the people to be subject to them, *considering not their works but their doctrine*, for that he says the chair of Moses, by the chair he shews the doctrine of the law."—*Per Cathedram ostendit doctrinam legis.* In words as clearly expressive as language can make them, Jerom says: that notwithstanding the enmity of the Pharisees, their artifices, and hypocrisy, the Saviour in respect to the dignity of the priesthood, "*propter sacerdotii dignitatem*," enjoined obedience to them who sat on Moses' chair; and that this obedience consisted in observing their doctrine, Jerom proves from Christ's mentioning the chair of Moses. From this passage the castigator garbles these few words: "by the chair of Moses, Christ means the doctrine of the Law," intimating that Christ did not enjoin obedience to the priests but to the law, of which in his new modelled doctrine every cobler was the sole competent judge. Even these few words which he garbles from the passage, are falsified to fit them some way

way or other to his purpoſe : it is inſupportably irkſome to be obliged to correct ſo many impoſtures. To this he adds a paſſage from St. Auſtin, which in the genuine ſenſe is a full condemnation of himſelf : " God therefore," ſays St. Auſtin, " teaches by them, (the paſtors of his own church) but if they teach doctrine of their own, do not hear them." If it be true as St Auſtin ſays, that God teaches by the paſtors of his own church, it is therefore true that he does not teach by ſelf conſtituted paſtors, or by paſtors appointed by others not authoriſed by him. But, continues Auſtin, if they teach doctrines of their own do not hear them. He could not more expreſsly, or with greater preciſion condemn all innovators : for if a prelate regularly inſtituted, and conſequently a true paſtor of Chriſt's church at the time of his inſtitution, preſumes to ſuppreſs the doctrine taught in his See, at the time of his acceſſion, and ſubſtitute his own opinions, the ſucceſſion ceaſes in him ; the people are not to believe him ; if this be true of a regularly inſtituted paſtor, when he preſumes to innovate, how much more manifeſtly true is it of a man, who, not being a paſtor of Chriſt's church at all, obtrudes his opinions on the people. But how may the people know that the paſtor, regularly inſtituted, changes the ancient doctrine. The intelligent part of the community know it by the teſtimony of their ſenſes : they know the doctrine, which they had learnt in their infancy, and they hear the innovator teach a doctrine inconſiſtent with it. That this new doctrine, is not the doctrine of the catholic church, they may know with unerring certainty from the deciſion of the paſtors aſſembled in union with their head, who proſcribe the error, and oblige the innovator to retract, or diſmiſs him from his charge. St. Auſtin, did not dream of ſending the faithful to examine the doctrine of innovators, by the rule of the ſcriptures, which not one of a thouſand in his time, could read, and of which not one of ten thouſand could procure a copy. This venerable prelate ſays : " the truth

of

of the ſcriptures is obſerved by us, when we do that which is determined by the univerſal church, which the authority of the ſcriptures themſelves commends: that, as the holy ſcripture cannot deceive, whoever fears to be deceived by the obſcurity of this queſtion, may conſult on it, that church, which the holy ſcripture without any ambiguity demonſtrates,"—Cont. Creſ. Cap. 33, N. 39. St. Auſtin, who knew the art of reaſoning as well as any writer, whoſe works have eſcaped the ravages of time, did not think this reaſoning in a vicious circle; he had not our Edinburgh caſtigator's *ob.* to direct him.

This writer in his Remarks p. 64. ſhewing the neceſſity of a living Judge, to determine the true conſtruction of the law, in doubtful caſes, and exclude the fictitious conſtructions of ignorant or intereſted individuals, had ſaid that ſuch a Judge, was expreſsly conſtituted by Moſes, in the old law—Deut. xvii, and refuting an aſſertion of Doctor Stanſer, importing that the people were referred in doubtful caſes to the ſcriptures, not to their paſtors, he had ſaid that the prophet Malachi thought the people ſhould ſeek the law from the mouth of the prieſt, p. 104; and p. 87 he had ſaid, that when Chriſt ſpoke of the lawful paſtors of the Jewiſh church, he had enjoined obedience and ſubmiſſion to their orders. We muſt admire the ſagacity of our Edinburgh caſtigator, who diſcovers in this an inconſiſtency. He admits that the paſſages are truly ſtated. If there be an inconſiſtency it muſt be either in his imagination or in the ſcriptures. He replies to the paſſage in Deut. xvii, that if infallibility be proved by it, it muſt apply to civil tranſactions as well as eccleſiaſtical diſcuſſions, and a ſhare be allowed to the Judge as well as to the high prieſt. If he had conſulted the ſcriptures, not his *ob.* he would have known that many of theſe tranſactions, which we call civil, were determined by the Jewiſh law, of which the Prieſts and Levites were the ſole judges, and though Jehoſaphat nominated ſome civil magiſtrates from other tribes to ſit in the Supreme Council, with the prieſts and Levites,

Levites, and judge with them in civil actions, yet all eccleſiaſtical diſcuſſions were reſerved to the judgment of the prieſts: "and alſo in Jeruſalem, Jehoſaphat appointed of the Levites, and of the prieſts and of the heads of the fathers, in Iſrael for the judgment of the Lord, and for controverſy for the inhabitants of Jeruſalem; and he commanded them, ſaying, thus you ſhall act in the fear of the Lord, in fidelity and with a peaceable heart; and every controverſy, which comes to you from your brethren dwelling in their cities, between blood and blood, between law and commandment, for ceremonies and cuſtoms, you ſhall ſhew them, and they will not ſin againſt the Lord, and wrath will not be on your brethren, thus you will do and you will not ſin. *And behold Amariah, the high prieſt, over you in every thing which regards the Lord*, and Zebadiah ſon of Iſmael, prince in the houſe of Judah, over every thing which regards the king, and the Levites teachers before you."—2d Chro. xix, 10, 11. Dr. Southwell on this paſſage ſays, that the civil magiſtrates would not have been admitted to ſet in the Supreme Council, if many of the prieſts and Levites, had not neglected their duty. Whether the ſeventy elders choſen by Moſes, Num. xi. 16, to compoſe the Supreme Council, were taken indiſcriminately from all the tribes, or excluſively from the tribe of Levi as Southwell, muſt have thought, and his opinion is rendered probable by the original text: for Moſes was ordered to collect them, whom he knew to be chiefs of the people and teachers: "*aſher jaditha chi hem Ziknei haam ve ſhoteraio.*" We know that the public inſtruction was committed to the Levites, it is unqueſtionably true, that all religious controverſies were reſerved to the judgment of the prieſts, over whom the high prieſt preſided; and that their deciſion was of infallible authority is equally certain: for two reaſons, which bear no reply: the firſt, becauſe God by his prophet ſays: "they will announce to you the word of judgment," *ve higidou leka diber hamiſphat*, which

which cannot, without blaſphemy, be underſtood of an unjuſt ſentence. To this firſt reaſon, the writer adds a ſecond of equal force: God orders diſobedience to their deciſion to be puniſhed by death; and God would not, nor could not conſiſtently with his juſtice and ſanctity, enjoin obedience to an iniquitous ſentence under ſo heavy a penalty. It is not jumbling unmeaning words together to introduce confuſion, and calling writers *great liars*, that will invalidate cloſe reaſoning.

After a vain effort to elude the force of the paſſage of Deut. xvii, by ſharing the infallibility between the high prieſt and the Judge, the caſtigator cites, from the writer's Remarks, theſe words of Malachi: "the lips of the prieſt ſhall preſerve knowledge, and they ſhall ſeek the law from his mouth, becauſe he is the meſſenger of the Lord." To this he replies, as if this writer had claimed an unerring authority for the individuals of the Aaronic prieſthood; an old artifice, by which many well meaning people have been deluded. Let him only conſult the following verſe, and he will ſee what infallibility the prieſts of theſe days diſcovered: "but ye are departed out of the way." What then? Though it be true that many of the prieſts did ſwerve from their duty, it is not the leſs true that it was their official duty to teach the law; and equally the duty of the faithful to ſeek the law from their mouth, as the prophet declared, and this writer aſſerted, authorized by him, in oppoſition to that inſult on common ſenſe, which ſends the illiterate mechanic to fiſh for the law in the ſcriptures.

Having amuſed his readers with ſome garbled extracts, and a few unmeaning words, which he calls diſcuſſing the Jewiſh infallibility, this caſtigator tells us that the Jewiſh church, like the Romiſh, generally found the prophets rank heretics, perſecuted and put them to death. Some impious princes did perſecute the prophets it is true, but that the Jewiſh church did judge them rank heretics, is rank nonſenſe. What other ſcriptures were read in their ſynagogues but the writings of the prophets? We

We are to underſtand that the Reformiſts, whom the Romiſh church judged heretics, were prophets. What a catalogue of new prophets his ſpirit of divination has diſcovered? One of them we know aſſumed the title of Evangeliſt of Wirtemberg, and was called the Germanic Prophet by his panegyriſts. This caſtigator no doubt will tell us when we may expect this new Meſſias, whoſe prophets have been rejected by the Romiſh church, or ſhall we believe the apoſtle, that this imaginary Chriſt, as yet expected by the Jews, is the real Antichriſt, and theſe pretended prophets his precurſors?

The paſtors of the Romiſh church, ſo called in modern cant, then and yet the Chriſtian church, not knowing that the Chriſtian prieſthood was to be transferred, and the covenant of the new law to be ſucceeded by another covenant, of which the prophets and apoſtles knew nothing, very naturally concluded that theſe new prophets were the men deſcribed by Jeſus Chriſt, when he ſaid: "beware of falſe prophets, who come to you in ſheep's clothing, but within they are ravening wolves," —Mat. vii, 15. They thought their teeth and claws uncommon, and their whining did not even in found reſemble the bleating of the ſheep. Be that as it will, the prophets, whether perſecuted by the Jewiſh church or not, never preſumed to reform the faith, the rites or ceremonies of that church; they never relinquiſhed the communion of that church. However ſeverely they cenſured the conduct of the prieſts, they communicated with them in the temple, and in their ſynagogues, aſſiſted at their ſacrifices and other rites and ceremonies. In what did theſe new prophets reſemble them? And Chriſt himſelf though rejected by them as was foretold, did not relinquiſh the communion of the Jewiſh church, until, by the iniquitous ſentence which condemned him to death, it ceaſed to be a church. He continued to honour the prieſthood, until the very inſtant of its final ceſſation: when the Council was aſſembled in which it was determined that

Chriſt ſhould die, John xi. 49 : one of them, Caiphas, being the high prieſt of that year, ſaid unto them : "you know nothing at all, nor do you conſider that it is expedient for us that one man ſhoud die for the people, and that the whole nation ſhould not periſh :" this, continues the Evangeliſt, "he did not ſay from himſelf, but being high prieſt of that year he propheſied that Jeſus ſhould die for that nation, and not for that nation only, but that alſo he ſhould collect in one the children of God, who were diſperſed abroad." Chriſt himſelf though ſilent on the heavy accuſations brought againſt him, yet when adjured by the high prieſt to declare if he were the Meſſias, obſerving that leſſon which he himſelf had taught, to reſpect the chair of Moſes, he admitted it. Let any man contraſt the meekneſs of Chriſt and his apoſtles with the unmanageable impetuoſity of theſe new-modelled prophets ; the modeſty of the replies of the former to the miniſters of the Jewiſh church, with that torrent of ſcurrilous abuſe, which the latter have poured out on the miniſters of the Chriſtian church, and which this caſtigator, in imitation of his anceſtors, continues to beſtow on their ſucceſſors, and he muſt be either unaccountably ſtupid, or inſuperably obſtinate, if he does not conclude that theſe pretended prophets have nothing in common with Chriſt or his apoſtles.

Having thus, as he imagines, ſuppreſſed every claim to infallibility in doctrine in the Jewiſh church, and ſhewn that the God of Truth and Sanctity had for ſo many ages on earth, either no church at all, or a church which taught error and authoriſed vice, the caſtigator, whoſe imagination is fruitful in wild conjectures and ridiculous ſubterfuges, pretends to diſcuſs the writer's proofs of the infallibility of the Romiſh Church : they are he ſays, p. 160, founded on the ſuppoſition that the Romiſh Church, is the Church of Chriſt to which the promiſes were made. True, and he now tells the caſtigator that the promiſes were made to ſome church ;

if

if it be not to the church of Rome, or, to ſpeak more correctly, to the church in communion with the See of Rome, this caſtigator no doubt, or his ſpirit of divination, or ſome other familiar ſpirit of the ſame ſpecies, will aſſign the church to which the promiſes were made, and ſhew its title more ancient than that of the church of Rome; until this happens the writer muſt perſiſt in his belief, that the church in communion with the See of Rome, is the church of Chriſt to which the promiſes were made.

In the next page the caſtigator cites from the writer's Remarks, this paſſage of Iſaiah ii. 3, "he will teach us his ways and we will walk in his paths;" and alſo theſe words of the writer: "God, whether he teaches by himſelf, as when viſible on earth, or by his miniſters, as ſince his aſcenſion, teaches no errors at all." This truth he has the condeſcenſion to admit, but finds a fancied evaſion in a reflection which only ſerves to confirm the truth: "if," ſays he, "theſe words prove infallibility at all, they teach as much freedom from error in obedience as in doctrine," which is true: for the church is not leſs faithful in her obedience to Jeſus Chriſt than in teaching his doctrine. If there be unſound members who diſobey Jeſus Chriſt, it is becauſe they diſobey his church, which ſtrictly enjoins and inceſſantly teaches her children to obſerve his law. If it be aſked, as it frequently is, why did not Chriſt exclude vice from his church, as well as error? The reply is ſimple: we muſt confine ourſelves to what he has deigned to promiſe, not diſtort his words nor extend them beyond their limits. To aſk why Chriſt has not done this, or that, betrays either ignorance or impudence or both, in all his words and actions he was directed by his wiſdom: he has promiſed to be with the paſtors of his church teaching and baptiſing until time ſhall be no more, it is blaſphemy to aſſert that the God of truth teaches falſehood; he has not promiſed to exclude vice or imperfection, on the contrary he has told us that the tares would be intermixed with

the

the wheat, until the harveſt, that is, that the children of darkneſs will be found indiſcriminately with the children of light until the conſummation, in the ſame ſenſe he has ſaid that the kingdom of Heaven is like a net caſt into the ſea, which takes fiſh of all kinds, but when full, it is brought to land, the good fiſh is preſerved for uſe, and the bad thrown away.—Matt. xiii. This muſt be underſtood of Chriſt's Kingdom in this world, for in the heavens there are none bad to be thrown out. The firſt object of the church, and its indiſpenſible duty, is to correct vice and reclaim ſinners, for this end Chriſt has given paſtors and teachers to his church, or, as St. Paul expreſſes it,—Eph. iv, to perfect the ſaints by the work of the miniſtry, for what is it to perfect the ſaints, by the work of the miniſtry, if it be not by preaching the word of God to reclaim ſinners, to convert infidels to the faith of Chriſt; to cleanſe them from ſin by adminiſtering the ſacrament of baptiſm; by other rites and ceremonies of Chriſt's inſtitution to ſtrengthen them; by adminiſtering the euchariſt to ſanctify them; by unremitting attention to prepare them for their place in the celeſtial kingdom, what St. Paul calls for the replacing the diſlocated members *pros katartiſmon*, to intimate the unity of the church, the myſtical body of Jeſus Chriſt, of which all his elect are members.

In his next ſubterfuge he adds a ſtriking inſtance of that total ignorance of the art of reaſoning, of which we have ſeen ſo many ſpecimens already. Infallibility in doctrine is uſeleſs, he ſays, if all the teachers be not infallible, and all the people who are to be taught be not alſo infallible. If he had not diſcarded common ſenſe from his councils, he would have known that the aſſent of the moſt illiterate peaſant to an infallible truth, is equally infallible, with that of the moſt acute philoſopher. The unerring certainty of any doctrine depends on its connexion with an infallible motive, not on the infallibility of the teacher, or the diſciple. Thus in geometry the aſſent of the ſchool boy to this propoſition,

propoſition, " the three angles of any right lined triangle are equal to two right angles," is as infallible, as that of a Newton or a Deſcartes, though neither the teacher nor the ſchool boy, have any pretenſions to infallibility, becauſe the truth of this propoſition reſts on mathematical demonſtration, a motive which founds an infallible aſſent. Thus again, the aſſent of the moſt illiterate peaſant in Nova-Scotia to this propoſition: " London is the chief city of England," is as infallibly certain, as that of the moſt intelligent man in the Province: why ſo? Becauſe this truth reſts on a motive as infallibly true, as mathematical demonſtration, that is, the teſtimony of man univerſal and uncontradicted, in like manner the aſſent of the moſt ignorant catholic to this catholic truth, " Chriſt is true God and true man," is as infallible as that of the moſt learned divine; why ſo? Becauſe this truth reſts on the teſtimony of God, who cannot deceive. An embarraſſing queſtion preſents itſelf, to which the man who recedes from the unity of the church, and diſclaims her infallible authority as a witneſs, can make no reply: " How is it known that God atteſts this catholic truth?" This queſtion ſhews the eſſential difference between the unerring faith of the catholic, and the uncertain opinion of the ſectary: the inſtant a man recedes from the unity of the church, he can no longer reclaim her teſtimony to authoriſe his faith. To the faith authoriſed by her teſtimony he ſubſtitutes an opinion, authoriſed by no other teſtimony but his own, which is manifeſtly, and even confeſſedly, fallible as he is himſelf: In vain he pretends to find his new opinion in the ſcriptures: he is told that the ſcriptures, together with the ſenſe in which they are underſtood, were depoſited by the inſpired writers in the hands of that church, which he diſclaims; that theſe ſcriptures were committed as a depoſit by the apoſtles to the paſtors to whom they entruſted the flock, and tranſmitted by right of inheritance to their lawful ſucceſſors in office; he is told, moreover, that in theſe ſcriptures others, not inferior to

him

him in point of ſcience, find, or pretend to find, an opinion directly oppoſite to his; that his teſtimony, in ſupport of his own opinion is not of greater weight than the teſtimony of others equally intelligent in ſupport of the contradictory: Thus, for inſtance; Arius found in the ſcriptures that Chriſt was true Man, but not true God; Eutyches found in the ſame ſcriptures that Chriſt was true God, but not true Man; Neſtorius found that there were two Chriſts, one true God, and the other true Man. Theſe opinions were equally falſe, and equally authoriſed: for the teſtimony of Arius, in ſupport of his own opinion was of as great weight as that of Eutyches in ſupport of the oppoſite, or that of Neſtorius in oppoſition to both. To deſcend to our own times; the oppoſite opinions of Arminius and Gomar, which divided the proteſtant churches and ſchools in Holland, and ſet that country in a flame, were equally authoriſed. Gomar, a rigid Calviniſt imagined he found in the ſcriptures, what he really found in Calvin's Inſtitution, "that Adam could not avoid his fall, and yet that he was not the leſs criminal becauſe he fell voluntarily." This doctrine, which makes God more hateful than the Devil, Calvin deduced from two ſuppoſed principles, equally falſe: the firſt: that God impoſes on all things, *and even on our will*, an irreſiſtible neceſſity; to this he adds a ſecond; that this neceſſity does not excuſe from ſin.—Lib. de ater. dei præ. Arminius, a benevolent man, who had nothing of that phlegmatic malignity, which characteriſed Calvin and his diſciple Gomar, in his compoſition, alarmed at this horrible doctrine, which propoſes to our belief, a God, who creates a man without his concurrence or conſent, makes him wicked by his irreſiſtible will, and damns him for crimes, which he could not avoid, in oppoſition to Gomar, found that in God there is a general will to ſave all men, and in Jeſus Chriſt a ſincere intention to redeem them, and means ſufficient offered to all. Theſe truths are found in the ſcriptures, but Arminius added that human nature was not

corrupted

corrupted by ſin, and that ſupernatural aſſiſtance was not neceſſary for the exerciſe of virtue. Hence Gomar's horrible paradox, and Arminius's benevolent opinion, though both falſe, are equally authoriſed; for the teſtimony of Gomar, or of his maſter, Calvin, in ſupport of his opinion, is not of greater weight, than the teſtimony of Arminius in defence of his own. It is therefore unqueſtionably true of all ſectaries, that their opinions are all equally uncertain, and conſequently that divine faith, which is an infallible aſſent to infallible truth, is not to be found but in that one church founded by the apoſtles, and governed by their ſucceſſors.

The catholic believes the truths of religion which tranſcend his reaſon on the infallible teſtimony of God, what we call divine revelation; that God has revealed theſe truths he believes on the unerring teſtimony of theſe paſtors, whom Chriſt ſent to teach theſe truths, which teſtimony is yet continued in their ſucceſſors. Againſt the Atheiſt and the Deiſt the Catholic ſhews that the teſtimony of many witneſſes neither deceived, nor deceivers atteſting a fact, is of unerring certainty; that the certainty of this teſtimony continued in ſucceeding generations without interruption or intermiſſion is invariably the ſame. Though the impreſſion on the ſenſes of the witneſſes may be ſtronger, the conviction on the underſtanding is not diminiſhed by time, we are as firmly convinced this day that Cæſar was murdered in the Senate, as the men who ſaw the body in the ſtreets of Rome; the horror of that atrocious act we ſcarcely feel: in like manner we are as well aſſured that Chriſt died on the croſs, roſe from the dead, and aſcended into Heaven, as the diſciples, who ſaw him nailed to the croſs, converſed with him after his reſurrection, and ſaw him aſcend on the mountain. The impreſſions made on the ſenſes of the diſciples by theſe affecting ſcenes, we may repreſent to ourſelves, but cannot feel: the conviction, however, on our underſtanding, is not the leſs irreſiſtible. From this teſtimony, indiſpenſably neceſſa-

ry

ry to aſcertain theſe facts, the infatuated, and ill-fated man, who recedes from the unity of the church, or, as St. Jude expreſſes it, "*ſeparates himſelf*," is precluded. Why ſo? Becauſe he diſclaims her teſtimony in ſupport of one truth, he cannot therefore claim it in ſupport of another; hence it neceſſarily follows, that he can have no certainty of any one of theſe great truths of religion, which are known but by teſtimony; ſuch are the Criſixion, the Reſurrection, the Aſcenſion of Jeſus Chriſt, the Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt on the Apoſtles, &c. for theſe are facts, and facts are not known by metaphyſical reaſoning, but by the teſtimony of witneſſes: from this teſtimony he is precluded; and in the range of imagination he cannot find a ſubſtitute: his appeal to the ſcriptures argues both ignorance and obſtinacy, and inſtead of an evaſion he finds in it his condemnation. For that the ſcriptures were written by authors divinely inſpired, and depoſited in the hands of the firſt paſtors of the church, is itſelf a fact, which cannot be known but by the teſtimony of the church; by his appeal therefore to the ſcriptures, he claims this very teſtimony, which he diſclaims, contradicts, and condemns himſelf. Hence St. Paul ſays that the ſectary is ſelf condemned, "*autokatakritos*,"—Ti. iii, 11. What, therefore, he calls his faith, is not that Divine faith *which is from hearing*,—Rom. x, and without which *it is impoſſible to pleaſe God*,—Heb. xi, 6, but a meer human opinion, which he has himſelf imagined, or taken on truſt from ſome other viſionary, or impoſtor, who whilſt he deceives others, is himſelf moſt cruelly deceived by that great impoſtor, whom the ſcripture emphatically calls *the father of lies*,—John viii, 44.

After a childiſh tale of a Romiſh paſtor, who preached to a congregation of rooks, this caſtigating paſtor, of a congregation more eaſily deluded than the rooks, if they be duped by ſuch nonſenſe, tranſcribes from the writer's Remarks theſe words of Iſaiah lix, "there ſhall come a Redeemer to Sion and to thoſe who return from iniquity

iniquity in Jacob"—ſee Remarks, p. 116. To this he replies: "Theſe words of Iſaiah reſpect only the reſtoration of the Jews, ſo that though they actually taught infallibility, the Church of Rome could have no claim to it; but did they even extend to the *Gentile* Church it is not of that kind for which the R. contends: it is ſomething in which the whole Church is equally intereſted."—p. 164. What a jumble of unmeaning ſounds he huddles together! The covenant of the Redeemer only reſpects the reſtoration of the Jews! The Romiſh Church has no claim to the infallibility promiſed by the prophet, though it may extend to the *Gentile Church!* The world had heard of a Chriſtian church, compoſed of Jews and Gentiles; but *a Gentile* church, that is a church, which does not know the true God, is a church of the caſtigator's invention. This promiſe the caſtigator thinks confined to the Jewiſh church, it may extend to the *Gentile* church, it is ſomething in which the whole church is intereſted. But if the whole church be intereſted in it, why exclude the Romiſh church from her ſhare? Is it becauſe it is neither a Jewiſh church nor a Heathen church? Hitherto the untaught world thought the covenant of the Redeemer was made with the redeemed; the covenant of Chriſt with the Chriſtian church; this Edinburgh caſtigator has undeceived us. The covenant of the Redeemer, he ſays, reſpects only the reſtoration of the Jews, it may perhaps extend to the Heathens, the Chriſtian church he excludes: for it is neither a ſociety of Jews, nor of Heathens, it is that very Romiſh church, which excites his indignation. That the whole church is intereſted in the promiſe is ſtrictly true; and ſerves to confirm this Catholic truth, that to the end of time errors in doctrine are by this promiſe excluded from it: for as the whole church is equally intereſted in the promiſe, the faithful are not leſs intereſted than their paſtors and teachers; by *their* miniſtry the ſaints are perfected,—Eph. iv. It is not by falſe doctrine the ſaints are perfected, it is therefore the moſt important intereſt of the faithful to bear

ſound doctrine from their paſtors and teachers; if then contrary to the promiſe the ſpirit of God be withdrawn from the paſtors, and the word of God ceaſe to be in their mouths, the people cannot be perfected by their miniſtry, the edifying of the body of Chriſt is interrupted, the promiſe is broken, the covenant is annulled, and the Chriſtian religion an illuſion.

The promiſe of Chriſt to ſend the Holy Ghoſt to the apoſtles, to teach them all truth and remain *with them for ever*, the caſtigator confines to the apoſtles themſelves: *for ever*, if we believe him, ſignifies *uninterrupted continuance*, not *perpetuity of duration*; other men, as intelligent as our caſtigator, think the term *for ever* ſtrictly expreſſive of both *uninterrupted continuance* and *perpetual duration*, and the common ſenſe of mankind, authoriſes their opinion in oppoſition to his fanciful conjecture: if a leaſe be made to a man for ever, his ſon would not be diſpoſſeſſed, under pretence that *for ever* in the contract implies no more than *uninterrupted continuance*, during the leſſee's life. The man, who would advance ſuch a plea in a court of law, would be diſmiſſed as a knave, or deſpiſed as a fool; that *for ever* in the promiſe of the Saviour implies both uninterrupted continuance and perpetual duration, is a truth, which impoſture may conteſt, and pertinacity reſiſt, but which reaſon unprejudiced is forced to admit: for the vigilance of Chriſt, the great ſhepherd, as St. Paul calls him *megas poimén*, who watches inceſſantly over his flock, is not diminiſhed by time: he his God immutable in his nature; his vigilance is not leſs neceſſary now, than it was in the apoſtle's days; nor is the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt leſs wanted for the conduct of his flock: that he continues to give, and will continue to give, paſtors and teachers to perfect the ſaints, his elect, until the conſummation of time, St. Paul atteſts without any ambiguity,—Eph. iv. The apoſtle's words are ſo clearly expreſſive, that the ingenuity of impoſture cannot diſtort them from the intended ſenſe.

That

That the apoſtles did themſelves receive the holy Ghoſt, the caſtigator admits, becauſe they wrought miracles; if theſe only, who wrought miracles, received the holy Ghoſt, the elect are few indeed; this caſtigator inadvertently excludes himſelf and all his reforming anceſtors from the number. Catholics tell him that this promiſe did not include the giſt of miracles: it is confined to the *gift of teaching all the truths*, which Chriſt had taught them, the official duty of the paſtors of Chriſt's church now, as it was then, a gift of uninterrupted continuance and perpetual duration, that is *for ever*, as Chriſt himſelf expreſſed it, for this ſimple reaſon, that it is at all times indiſpenſibly neceſſary, and if at any time it ceaſed, Chriſt would at that time ceaſe to watch over his flock, and annul his covenant, which is blaſphemy to aſſert.

St. Paul, in his firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians, xii, compares the church of Chriſt to the human body; the component members of this myſtical and moral body, the church, are correſpondent to the component parts of the natural body, of which each has its appropriate function, to which its natural powers are adequate and excluſively confined, thus each member contributes to the ſymmetry and perfection of the whole; in like manner, if the apoſtle has not deceived us, in the church every member compoſing that myſtical body has its appropriate place, determined by that one ſpirit, which animates the whole, and receives from that ſame ſpirit gifts appropriate, and adequate to its functions, 4. "There are diverſities of gifts but the ſame ſpirit, ... if the foot ſhall ſay, becauſe I am not the hand I am not of the body, is it, therefore, not of the body? . . . . . But now hath God ſet the members every one of them, in the body, as it hath pleaſed him . . . . . 28, and theſe, therefore, God has placed in the church, firſt apoſtles, ſecondly prophets, thirdly *teachers* . . . . . are all apoſtles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? . . . The gift of teaching is manifeſtly appropriate to the function of the ordinary teacher; the gift of miracles, is appropriate

priate to the function of the extraordinary teacher, becauſe it is neceſſary that he ſhould authenticate his immediate miſſion from God : by this exerciſe of his almighty power, God atteſts the miſſion of theſe, whom he immediately ſends to teach in his name—the apoſtles were poſſeſſed of both theſe gifts ; of the gift of teaching in virtue of the promiſe, John xvi, 13. "When he, the ſpirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth," and xiv, 26. "But the comforter, the Holy Ghoſt, whom the father will ſend in my name, he will teach you all things, and remind you of all things, which I have ſaid to you," and of the gift of miracles to authenticate their miſſion in virtue of the power veſted in them by Jeſus Chriſt, when he ſent them to preach.—Matt. x, 1. "And having called his twelve diſciples to him, he gave them power over unclean ſpirits to caſt them out, and to heal every ſickneſs and every diſeaſe" ..... theſe twelve Jeſus ſent and commanded them ..... as ye go, preach, ſaying, the kingdom of heaven is near, heal the ſick, cleanſe lepers, raiſe the dead, caſt out demons ..... the apoſtles therefore were poſſeſſed of the gift of miracles long before the ſaviour promiſed to ſend the Holy Ghoſt to teach them all truth, and remain with them for ever, theſe gifts, ſo different in themſelves, and appropriate to ſuch different functions, this caſtigator ignorantly confounds. The gift of miracles neceſſary to authenticate the miſſion of the apoſtles and appropriate to that apoſtolical function, he requires in their ſucceſſors, whoſe miſſion is unqueſtionable, and to whoſe function the gift of teaching is perfectly adequate and appropriate.

From the apoſtle's doctrine, 1ſt Cor. xii, concluſions are deduced, which this Edinburgh caſtigator may find difficult to conteſt, and ruinous to admit ; if it be true, as the apoſtle ſays, that God places every member in the body as it pleaſes himſelf, and diſtributes to each member gifts appropriate to its determined place, as the powers of each member of the human body are appropriate

to

to its function, on what principle does this caſtigator pretend that the gift of teaching, one of theſe expreſsly noted by the apoſtle, is appropriate to the place aſſigned to him? If God gives teachers to his church, as the apoſtle repeatedly inculcates, it muſt be either in the ordinary manner, by uninterrupted ſucceſſion from the apoſtles, or, in an extraordinary manner, by immediate appointment: between theſe extremes imagination can reach no mean. Is this caſtigating paſtor a teacher in the ordinary manner, by uninterrupted ſucceſſion from the apoſtles? If not, the gift of teaching is no more appropriate to his place in the body, than the power of ſeeing is appropriate to the ear. Is he a teacher in an extraordinary manner, by immediate appointment as the apoſtles were? If ſo the gift of miracles is appropriate to his place, and as indiſpenſibly neceſſary to authenticate his miſſion, as it was to authenticate the miſſion of the apoſtles. Does he poſſeſs this gift? If not, he is not a teacher given by God either in the ordinary way or by an extraordinary appointment. And as the gift of teaching is excluſively appropriate and confined to theſe teachers, whom God gives to his church, this gift is not appropriate to his place in the body at all. The aſſumption, therefore, of the office of teacher, without the gift of teaching, is productive of the ſame confuſion in the myſtical body, as if the ear ſhould aſſume the office of the eye, to perſonify the members of the human body as the apoſtle has done: "To the impious man God ſays why doſt thou announce my ſtatutes and take my covenant in thy mouth? Thou hateſt diſcipline, and doſt throw my words behind thee,"—Ps. l. This may ſerve as a leſſon to coblers, who ought to mend ſhoes, inſtead of cobbling the ſouls of a deluded populace.

In place of the gift of miracles appropriate to teachers of immediate appointment, by which this caſtigator's anceſtors ought, but did not, authenticate their miſſion, paſtors of the catholic church aſſign that proof, which unequivocally ſhews that the gift of teaching is appropriate

priate to their place in the myſtical body of Jeſus Chriſt, as that is the function aſſigned to them, in like manner as the powers of the eye are appropriate to the organ of ſight, not to the ear, the organ of hearing, the function of which being different from that of the organ of ſight, requires powers of a different character: to the paſtors and teachers Chriſt ſaid: "go teach all nations . . . . . I am with you until the conſummation of time," —Matt. ult. To them he had ſaid, where two or three are aſſembled in my name, there am I in the midſt of them.—Matt. xviii, 20. Theſe teachers, and theſe only, aſſemble in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, who are veſted with that power of teaching, which is derived from Jeſus Chriſt through his apoſtles, as theſe magiſtrates, and theſe only, aſſemble in the name of the King, who are veſted with the civil authority derived from the King, through his immediate officers; others may aſſemble in their own name, but not in the name of the King, thus the paſtors of Chriſt's church aſſemble in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, and he himſelf according to his promiſe aſſiſts, all others aſſemble in their own name. When we hear of crowded aſſemblies of ſelf-appointed itinerant preachers convened, as gregarious animals of the ſame ſpecies meet in the fields, though we may be tempted to ſmile at ſuch an inſtance of public folly, yet we are forced to lament the infatuation of our brethren, who are the deluded victims of the artifices of that ſpirit of illuſion, which preſides over theſe aſſemblies. When we open their evangelical magazines, theſe records of infanity, our aſtoniſhment is increaſed; we feel the degradation of human nature; if church hiſtory had not given many inſtances of ſuch a blind infatuation, or, to call it by a more appropriate name, of ſuch a degrading fatuity, we could hardly think it poſſible; it is not to be accounted for on any principle of reaſon; it indicates, therefore, a myſterious exerciſe of Divine Juſtice, which, for reaſons known to Sovereign Wiſdom, effaces not only the light of religion, but the light of reaſon as far as it is connected with religion. Theſe

Theſe artful efforts to elude the force of the promiſes of Chriſt to his church, which our Edinburgh caſtigator has borrowed from his anceſtors, have induced the writer to explain them with more preciſion than he had done in his remarks on Dr. Stanſer, and deduce concluſions, which, however unpleaſant to a groupe of ſelf-conſtituted teachers, are not the leſs infallibly true. The next ſubterfuge deſerves no notice : This writer had ſaid that God dwells in his church as in his temple authoriſed by St. Paul, 2d Cor. vi, and concluded that his preſence excludes every ſhade of error, as light expels darkneſs, and as faith effaces infidelity. To this the caſtigator replies, that the apoſtle ſpeaks of chriſtians individually. Of what elſe would the apoſtle ſpeak ? Is the man's ignorance ſo groſs as to think that a collective body has any exiſtence ſeparate from the individuals which compoſe it ? If God dwells in his Church it muſt be in the individuals who compoſe it, and if he excludes error it muſt be from the minds of individuals who without his preſence are ſubject to it, not from a Being which has no exiſtence but that which reaſon beſtows on it : it is, therefore, true, or St. Paul miſtakes, that God dwells in the individuals who compoſe his Church, theſe he animates with his divine preſence as the ſpirit animates the united members of the body ; not theſe members, which are by any accident ſeparated from it. In the ſame page, 168, paſſing in ſilence that irreſiſtible maſs of evidence, collected by this writer from the inſpired writings in defence of this truth, that errors are excluded from the Church of Chriſt by the vigilance of that ſupreme paſtor, and the unremitting attention of his divine ſpirit. The caſtigator ſays it is not neceſſary to examine them, becauſe this writer, if we believe him, ſuppoſes the whole viſible church to be Chriſt's ſpiritual ſeed to which the promiſes were made, and then draws the concluſion that theſe will be preſerved from the leaſt ſhade of error. This ſubterfuge ſavours more of impoſture than ignorance, deſpair alone ſuggeſts it.

it. If by Christ's spiritual seed the elect be understood, as it must, the writer supposes no such thing, draws no such conclusion: he knows that on the threshing floor the wheat is mixed with the chaff; that in Peter's net the good and bad fish were taken: that the clean and unclean animals were in Noah's Ark; he knows that though there are many within the pale of the church who are not of the number of the elect, yet all the elect are in it; that in it the saints are perfected by the ministry of the pastors and teachers, he knows also that to this visible church, in which the saints are perfected, the promises were made, and if this castigator does not know it, his ignorance is both criminal and inexcusable: for the promises were made to some church; and an invisible church composed of men, women and children is a chimera, the ridiculous invention of imposture to mislead the unwary and the ignorant. And as the promises were made to this visible church he concludes that errors in faith are excluded from it, not from every individual, who may at any time be in it; an army is not the less victorious because some desert and others are killed. It is so with the church, some are over-powered by the enemy of man, others desert and range themselves under different leaders, and assume different names; but the great body remains entire, impenetrable to the shafts of the enemy, unmoved by the artifices of imposture, and unshaken by the terrors of persecution. This writer knows that in the visible church the faith of Jesus Christ is found, and his doctrine taught in its purity, though some individuals may fall into error and heresy; because it is not by these seducers that the church teaches, but by her lawful pastors in communion with their head; he knows from St. Jude i. that there are murmurers, complainers, scoffers, who separate themselves; and he knows from reason that if these men be not in the visible church it is not possible for them to separate themselves: for no man can separate himself from a society, of which he is not a member; he knows from St. Paul, Acts xx,

30 :

30 : that of Chriſtians, for they were Chriſtians to whom the apoſtle ſpoke, ſome ariſe, and teach falſe doctrine to draw diſciples after themſelves ; finally, he knows from church hiſtory that all apoſtates and hereſiarchs from Judas the traitor, and Simon the magician, down to Voltaire, Diderot and d'Alembert, the apoſtles of Atheiſm, and Weiſhaupt, the patriarch of the Illuminati, have been members of the Church, from which they ſeparated themſelves, and by the act of ſeparation condemned themſelves. Our caſtigator, who would embarraſs truth if nature had bleſſed him with talents equal to that arduous taſk, or even correſpondent to his deſires, having aſcribed to this writer a falſe ſuppoſition, which he did not make, and a concluſion equally falſe, which he did not draw, to refute this error of his own invention, falſely aſcribes to the Churches in Aſia errors which were not taught in them ! The man's underſtanding is ſo impervious to truth, or his native diſpoſition ſo inimical to conviction, that even by accident diſcoloured truth cannot eſcape his pen : from the fœtid exhalations of his diſordered brain, he draws ſome cloud to envelope it. If we believe him, *groſs errors* were taught in the Aſiatic churches, yet Chriſt acknowledged their relation to himſelf, p. 169. St. John ſays, that Chriſt did reprimand ſome of the biſhops, or angels, as he calls them, of the Seven Churches ; but not one of them for teaching falſe doctrine. This caſtigator calumniates Chriſt himſelf, if he ſays that he accuſed them Biſhops of teaching falſe doctrine, and he calumniates the Biſhops if he pretends that they taught a doctrine, for which Chriſt did not reprimand them. The Biſhop of Pergamos was reprimanded, becauſe there were amongſt his people ſome ſeducers, whom he ought either to have corrected or retrenched from his communion, but did not, for if he had he would not have been reprimanded ; he was therefore cenſured for a neglect of duty, not for teaching falſe doctrine, on the contrary Chriſt approved his faith : " Thou holdeſt faſt my name, and haſt not denied my faith"—Rev. ii, 13.

The Biſhop of Thyatira was reprimanded alſo for permitting, or, to ſpeak more correctly, for not preventing the pretended propheteſs to ſeduce ſome of his people. Does the caſtigator think that this woman was one of the Miniſters of the Church of Thyatira, or that ſhe was authoriſed by the Biſhop to teach falſe doctrine? He muſt be ſtupid indeed, who believes it. It is not on a biſhop, who teaches falſe doctrine, or authoriſes it, that Chriſt himſelf beſtows ſuch encomiums: "I know thy works, and thy charity, and thy faith, and thy patience, and thy works, and the laſt more full than the firſt." iii, 19. Yet for a neglect of duty he reprimanded him: "becauſe," ſaid the Saviour, "thou ſuffereſt that woman Jezabel, who calls herſelf a propheteſs, to teach and ſeduce my ſervants",—iii, 20. It is therefore true, that a man may be a ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt, and by the artifices of ſome impoſtor may be ſeduced, and renounce him.

The biſhop of Sardis was reprimanded, not for teaching or believing error, nor even for any neglect of duty, but for ſome hidden fault, which deprived his works of all merit: "I know thy works," ſaid the Saviour, "becauſe thou haſt the name that thou liveſt, and thou art dead ..... I have not found thy works full in preſence of God"—iii, 1–2. In the ſimplicity of them early times, before the hemiſphere of religion had been enlightened by the lucubrations of the Germanic Prophet and his reforming aſſociates, good works were thought as neceſſary to ſalvation as faith. Chriſt himſelf appears to have been of that opinion. Of all theſe Biſhops, whom he reprimanded, and ſome of them ſeverely, not one was accuſed of having falſified, renounced or forgotten the faith, or of any defect whatever in faith: they were all reprimanded for other reaſons: the Biſhop of Epheſus for a diminution in charity—"thou haſt left thy firſt love;" ii. 4. The biſhop of Pergamos, for a neglect of duty: "Becauſe thou haſt there them, who hold the doctrine of Balaam"....—ii, 13. The biſhop of Thyatira, for the ſame reaſon: "becauſe thou ſuffereſt that woman Jezabel,

bel," . . . . ii, 20. The biſhop of Sardis, for ſome capital, but hidden offence, which deprived him of ſanctifying grace, the life of the Soul: . . . . . "thou haſt a name that thou liveſt, but thou art dead," iii, 1. The biſhop of Laodicea, becauſe he was lukewarm, becauſe his charity, though not abſolutely dead, was on the point of being extinguiſhed: "becauſe thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot" . . . . iii, 15.

This indefatigable tranſcriber fills a page, with an extract from the remarks on Dr. Stanſer, in which the writer had ſtated ſome of the promiſes made to the church, and from them concluded that, if at any time groſs errors were taught by the paſtors, and believed by the people, the gates of hell would prevail, and the promiſes prove ineffectual; this truth intuitive and extorting the aſſent, where prejudice does not blind, nor intereſt deprave the mind, the caſtigator denies; he thinks that the promiſes to preſerve the church entire, do not extend to the excluſion of groſs errors, ſo that, in his new modelled opinion, Chriſt may be head of a church which teaches hereſy, idolatry, atheiſm or epicureiſm: for if one groſs error be taught in the church no reaſon can be aſſigned why any other may not: as all errors are equally oppoſite to truth: thus, for inſtance, it is not leſs falſe that a triangle is compoſed of four ſides and four angles, than that it is compoſed of fifty ſides and five hundred angles. It is ſcarcely credible that a man, who calls himſelf a chriſtian, would preſume to aſſert that Chriſt does not teach his church by the miniſtry of the paſtors, though he expreſsly promiſed it, or that by their miniſtry the God of Truth and Sanctity would teach falſe doctrine, hereſy or idolatry—there is ſomething ſo horribly blaſphemous in the aſſertion, that it is irkſome to diſcuſs it: however, this opinion the caſtigator endeavours to ſupport, in his uſual way, by a bold aſſertion, and one or two paſſages which condemn it. "It is," ſays he, "repugnant to the experience of the church"—p. 170: that, in other words, it is repugnant to the experience of the church, that Chriſt ſhould preſerve

preſerve it from error: but it is not repugnant to the experience of the church that Chriſt promiſed to give paſtors to his church, and teach the faithful by their miniſtry; and it is repugnant to common ſenſe that he would teach error by their miniſtry, and repugnant to common decency to aſſert it. He does not ſeem to be aware of the tendency of the paſſages, which he adduces, not to ſupport an opinion, the falſhood and abſurdity of which he muſt have felt, but to amuſe readers of a certain deſcription for whom he writes. "The Apoſtle Paul informs us, that ſome in the Corinthian Church denied the Reſurrection; that Hymeneus and Philetus erred in doctrine, and were believed by the people"—p. 170. He calumniates the apoſtle! For Paul does not ſay *that they were believed by the people*, but, as he himſelf cites it: "that they overthrew the faith of ſome." But Paul does not inform us that Hymeneus and Philetus were the ſole paſtors of the church, nor does he ſay that they were paſtors of the church at all; he does not tell us that the few, whoſe faith was ſubverted by theſe impoſtors, compoſed the Church of Corinth, much leſs the Church of Chriſt diſperſed in different nations, but he gives us a piece of information terrible in the extreme to this Edinburgh caſtigator, a piece of information that muſt fill his ſoul with anguiſh, if his averſion to popery has not ſteeled his conſcience againſt fear and remorſe, as well as his underſtanding againſt truth and conviction: for the apoſtle informs us, that he himſelf, one of theſe paſtors legally inſtituted, delivered theſe and ſuch like ſeducers over to Satan, that they might learn not to blaſpheme: "This charge I commit to thee, Son Timothy, according to preceding prophecies concerning thee, that thou mayeſt fight a good battle, having faith and a good conſcience, which ſome having put away, concerning faith, have ſuffered ſhipwreck, of theſe are Hymeneus and Alexander, whom I have delivered over to Satan, that they may learn not to blaſpheme"—1ſt Tim. i, 18. In the paſſage cited by the caſtigator to ſhew that Chriſt's promiſe

promiſe of preſerving his church did not extend to exclude groſs errors, we have a ſignal inſtance of the contrary, in it the attention of the Great Shepherd to the welfare of his Flock is manifeſt: the error, which was inſidiouſly introduced, and which, creeping like a cancer, began to infect the incautious part of the flock. was immediately detected, the progreſs ſtopped. the proper remedy applied to eradicate the diſeaſe: that is, the warning voice of the legally authoriſed paſtor, and the ſeducers by his miniſtry delivered over to Satan.—A terrible warning to all reformiſts and inventors of novelty. From the ſame paſſage we learn another truth, which this caſtigator did not perceive: that is, that error in faith when imputable, or, in other words, when not excuſed by invincible ignorance or inevitable neceſſity, excludes from ſalvation: for the apoſtle ſays that they who erred in faith ſuffered ſhipwreck; it is hardly neceſſary to remark that the man who falls into the ſea can find no ſafety but in a return to the veſſel. The error of theſe early reformiſts, Hymeneus, Philetus and Alexander, the apoſtle corrected in his firſt epiſtle to the Cor. xv, the people he reclaimed, as we find no veſtige of that error after amongſt them; the Seducers, incorrigible it is preſumed, he delivered over to Satan; thus eſtabliſhed a precedent in the church, which has been religiouſly obſerved. The writer would not be underſtood to extend the ſtrictures, which he occaſionally makes on reformiſts and innovators, to any of the people ſeduced by their artifices, nor to their ſucceſſors, whether they teach the errors of their predeceſſors, or add to them their own conjectures; his ſtrictures apply excluſively to theſe, who, originally members of the catholic church, ſeparated themſelves and formed ſects in oppoſition to it; their ſucceſſors are perfectly innocent of their apoſtacy, and not having been originally in the communion of the catholic church, they could not ſeparate themſelves from it. Whether a perſuaſion, ariſing from motives unfounded, but by them thought ſolid, may excuſe or extenuate a perſeverance in error,

is a queſtion which this writer does not think proper to diſcuſs. Our caſtigator, who is profuſe in his citations, adds a paſſage from St. Peter's ſecond epiſtle, ii: "there ſhall be falſe teachers among you, who ſhall bring in privily damnable hereſies . . . . . and many ſhall follow their pernicious ways." As the caſtigator only gives theſe few words, which are as much to his purpoſe as the firſt verſe of Geneſis, the writer adds the omiſſion: "but there were alſo falſe prophets among the people, as there will be falſe teachers among you, who will introduce ſects of perdition, and, denying the Lord, who bought them, will bring on themſelves ſwift deſtruction, 2d Pet. ii, 12, and many will follow their deſtructive *ways*, '*apoleias*,' by whom the way of truth will be blaſphemed." Peter ſays that there were falſe prophets amongſt the Jews, but he does not ſay that theſe falſe prophets were the paſtors of the Jewiſh church, nor does he ſay that the Jewiſh people were deceived by them though many were as we know from the inſpired writings; he ſays alſo that there will be falſe teachers amongſt us Chriſtians, and that many will follow their deſtructive ways, and woful experience has verified this prediction; but he does not ſay that theſe falſe teachers are or will be the paſtors of the Chriſtian church, or that all Chriſtians will be ſeduced by them; he ſays: "they will introduce ſects of perdition," *oitenes pareiſaxousin áireſeis apoleias*, this phraſe the caſtigator tranſlates, "who ſhall privily bring in damnable hereſies." The ſubſtantive *apōleia*, which ſignifies *perdition* or *deſtruction*, he converts into the adjective *damnable*, and by his apoſtolical authority he adds the adverb *privily*, which Peter forgot, and Paul was ſo far from thinking that they would introduce their deſtructive opinions *privily*, that ſpeaking of falſe teachers, who reſiſt the truth, as Jannes and Jambres, the Egyptian magicians, reſiſted Moſes, the apoſtle ſays: "their folly will be manifeſt to all"—2. Tim. iii. 9.

Our caſtigator is invariably unlucky in his ſelection of paſſages

paſſages from his repertory. Imagination is racked in vain to diſcover ſomething to give a colour of truth to ſubterfuges, which deſpair only can ſuggeſt. To diſtort truth in ſupport of error is a taſk, for which Nature has not qualified him; but to force a truth to countenance an error, which it expreſsly condemns, ſurpaſſes folly: in the inſpired writings there is not perhaps a paſſage, in which all ſects and ſectaries are more explicitly condemned, and their diſtinctive characteriſtic marked with greater preciſion, than that which he has cited from St. Peter's epiſtle: the apoſtle ſays: "there will be falſe teachers, who will introduce *ſects* or *hereſies* of perdition." Where will they introduce them if not amongſt chriſtians pre-exiſting? And what doctrine will they endeavour to corrupt if not the doctrine taught in the church when they begin to dogmatiſe? All ſects, therefore, are originally formed of catholics ſeduced by falſe teachers: they commence amongſt catholics, and by their falſe doctrine begin to corrupt the doctrine then taught by the paſtors, and believed by the people. This characteriſtic diſtinguiſhes falſe teachers ſo plainly that even ignorance cannot miſtake them: thus, for inſtance, when Arius began to dogmatiſe, ſome few catholics were ſeduced by him, and formed a ſect, which in a ſhort time ſwelled to an immenſe multitude, but yet the diſtinctive characteriſtic aſſigned by St. Peter was perfectly applicable to the ſect: for Arius did not pretend that all the biſhops of the then catholic world were falſe teachers, who introduced a ſect of perdition amongſt the Arians then in poſſeſſion of all chriſtian churches; of catholics ſeduced by his artifices he formed a ſect amongſt catholics, the catholic prelates did not form a ſect of ſeduced Arians amongſt Arians, he therefore was one of theſe falſe teachers foretold by St. Peter, and his followers compoſed one of thoſe ſects of perdition introduced by falſe teachers; to come nearer home, when Luther began to dogmatiſe in Saxony, he did not pretend that the biſhops, then paſtors in lawful ſucceſſion, introduced any

ſect

ſect or hereſy amongſt Lutherans pre-exiſting and poſſeſſing all Chriſtian churches, the biſhops did not then begin to corrupt the doctrine taught in all churches; Luther, therefore, was one of theſe falſe teachers, his ſect was formed of catholics ſeduced by him amongſt catholics, the catholic biſhops did not form a ſect of Lutherans ſeduced amongſt Lutherans. This reaſoning is applicable to all ſects, and bears no reply: "for it was never pretended by any ſect that they themſelves were in poſſeſſion of all churches, and their paſtors, in regular ſucceſſion from the apoſtles, poſſeſſed of all right of preaching and teaching, when ſome one or other began to form a ſect amongſt them. The man, who weighs diſpaſſionately the force of this reaſoning and reſiſts it, is not within the reach of conviction: either incurable ſtupidity, or invincible obſtinacy has ſo depraved his underſtanding, that even intuitive truth can make no impreſſion on it.

The enſuing pages are filled with an extract from this writer's remarks, in which the obedience enjoined by St. Paul to the paſtors of the church is ſtated, and the rule preſcribed by St. John to diſtinguiſh falſe teachers. To this the caſtigator replies: that obedience to magiſtrates, parents and maſters, is alſo enjoined by the apoſtle—this ſeems to be his favourite evaſion, it has been already diſcuſſed. The writer now adds that this precept of obedience to the civil magiſtrate, which the caſtigator ſeems to diſregard, ſtrictly obliges in all civil cauſes which are of his juriſdiction; that it is his official duty to underſtand the civil law, and explain it to contending parties; that it is intolerable preſumption in a cobbler or coal porter to pretend to direct him, or refuſe to acquieſce in the ſentence, which he has juridically pronounced, until they have examined it, and found it conſiſtent with the laws, of which they know nothing, but what they learn from him; in like manner this precept of obedience to the paſtors of the church obliges, under penalty of perdition, in all religious diſputes, which are of their juriſdiction;

it

it is their official duty to underſtand, and explain the laws of the goſpel to the cobbler and the coal porter, and to all the illiterate and uninformed, who compoſe an incalculable majority of Chriſtians, and who neither know, nor can know any thing of the goſpel, but what they learn from their teachers; and from this reaſoning, which may be denied, becauſe there is no truth which may not be denied, but cannot be invalidated or eluded, he concludes that the rule preſcribed by St. John, to diſtinguiſh falſe teachers, is the moſt ſimple and the moſt infallible that can be deviſed: this is a reflexion of which the moſt illiterate man or woman is capable: Arius ſays that all the paſtors of the church are deceived, that he alone underſtands the ſcriptures, and they do not; he diſobeys them; he is one of theſe falſe teachers. This reaſoning is ſtrictly applicable to every Reformiſt; it is the dictate of common ſenſe, independent on logical or metaphyſical diſcuſſion. "It did not occur to this writer," ſays the caſtigator, p. 173, "that this very rule of St. John is a rule of the ſcriptures, which the unlearned he ſays do not underſtand." His ſpirit of divination deceives him: it did occur to this writer that St. John's rule, is a rule of the ſcriptures, infallible as the ſcriptures; but which the unlearned did not learn from the ſcriptures, which one of a thouſand at that time could not read, but from their paſtors, from whom they learned all, that they knew, and all that they were obliged to know of the ſcriptures, as the caſtigator's ſervant maid learns from him the opinions of Calvin or Gomar, or his own diſcoveries in the hitherto unexplored regions of religious fancy, not in the ſcriptures, of which ſhe may admire the fine pictures. In the ſame page he tells us, that "St. John, inſtead of referring the members of the church to their teachers, implicitly turns their attention to the doctrine of the ſcriptures, and tells them to exerciſe their judgment by bringing the inſtructions of the Clergy to this teſt," This paradox his ſpirit of divination diſcovers in theſe words of the

apoſtle, " beloved believe not every ſpirit, but try the ſpirits whether they are of God ; becauſe many falſe prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know you the ſpirit of God : every ſpirit that confeſſeth that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh is of God ; and every ſpirit that confeſſeth not that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh is not of God."—1 John, iv, 1–3. We admire the unexampled ſagacity of his ſpirit ; he has diſcovered that theſe falſe prophets and lying ſpirits were neither leſs nor more than the paſtors of the chriſtian church, or, as he calls them, the clergy ; and he detects, in St. John's words, a latent order to the people, which had hitherto eſcaped the notice of the world, to bring the inſtructions of theſe falſe prophets, and lying ſpirits, their clergy, to the teſt of the ſcriptures : a ſimple man, judging by the rules of common ſenſe, would have thought that St. John intended to inſtruct the clergy, and through them to warn the people againſt the artifices of falſe teachers. What renders this conjecture probable is, that many of the people could not read, that they were not all prophets, and could not know the contents of the apoſtle's letter by inſpiration, in a word, that they had no poſſible mean of knowing the apoſtle's inſtructions but from their teachers. The world is greatly indebted to the caſtigator's inſtructing ſpirit, though ſome ſimpletons, from the ſtriking reſemblance, may miſtake it for one of theſe ſpirits, of which the apoſtle ſpoke. In the next page we find another diſcovery, which had alſo eſcaped the notice of an undiſcerning world for many ages : implicit obedience to the church is repugnant to the ſpirit of the goſpel ; diſobedience, therefore, is an evangelical virtue. This he finds in theſe words of St. John : " we are of God, he, that knoweth God heareth us ; he, that is not of God heareth us not." A man, not enlightened by the caſtigator's inſtructing ſpirit, would very naturally conclude from theſe words, that the apoſtle knew nothing of that new modelled virtue " diſobedience :" in terms as intelligible as ever were penned, the apoſtle aſſigns

obedience

obedience as the diſtinctive characteriſtic of the children of God. It is the knowledge of God that produces ſubmiſſion to the faithful miniſters, ſays the caſtigator; who ever doubted it? But where this knowledge, ſays he, is wanted, there may be ſubmiſſion and credulity, but no faith; there may be, and is, too often unfortunately, ſubmiſſion and credulity to other miniſters, but not to the miniſters of Chriſt, for it is not poſſible for the man, who does not know Jeſus Chriſt, to have any reſpect, or pay any ſubmiſſion to himſelf or his miniſters, and this is preciſely what the apoſtle ſays: "he who knoweth God, heareth us; and he, who is not of God, heareth us not."

In the ſame page, 174, he tells us that the unlearned are capable of trying ſtrange doctrines by the rule of the ſcriptures; he has not told us how the unlearned, who neither read, nor can read the ſcriptures, know their contents, to compare ſtrange doctrines with them. Can they try them by a rule of which they know nothing? The writer preſumes to inform him, that the unlearned, who have never read a line in the ſcriptures, may, with great facility, and unerring certainty, detect falſe teachers, by that ſimple rule, preſcribed by St. John, which they learn from their paſtors; and having detected the falſe teacher, they muſt conclude, that his doctrine is falſe. Thus the Redeemer, in his paternal cares of his flock, provides for the moſt illiterate as well as for the moſt intelligent, an effectual preſervative againſt error; but minutely to diſcuſs the opinions of falſe teachers, and compare them with the doctrines of the ſcriptures, is what the unlearned cannot do; the pretence is offenſive to reaſon; the moſt groſs artifice of impoſture: the man, who tells the illiterate mechanic, that he underſtands the ſcriptures, which he cannot read, flatters him with the idea that he is himſelf a competent judge of true or falſe doctrine; that he is capable of comparing obſtruſe doctrines, of which the man has no idea at all, with the ſcriptures of

which

which he knows nothing, intentionally impoſes on his credulity. The unlearned, ſays the caſtigator, may poſſeſs a very accurate knowledge of the doctrines of religion: yes; no man doubts it; but this knowledge they muſt obtain from the inſtruction of their paſtors and teachers, not from the ſcriptures, the contents of which they cannot know but from their teachers. Hence it is that the moſt illiterate catholic, who has learned his catechiſm by rote, and heard it explained by his paſtor, has a more accurate knowledge of religion than this caſtigating paſtor, and all his aſſociates; hence it is alſo, that the moſt illiterate Calviniſt, who has learned his catechiſm by rote, and heard his paſtor explain it, has a more accurate knowledge of the wild conjectures of Calvin, than any catholic not verſed in controverſy. Why ſo? Becauſe theſe are the doctrines impreſſed on his mind by his miniſter, whilſt in the face of truth and experience, he himſelf is told, and the world is taught to believe, that he finds theſe doctrines in the ſcriptures, of which perhaps he never could read a line.

Upon mature conſideration our caſtigator thinks that obedience and ſubmiſſion may be due to the miniſters of Chriſt; to himſelf, we muſt preſume, and his brethren of the new ſchool, and laſt appointment, but the Romiſh church has no claim to it—*veteres migrate Coloni*—old faſhioned fellows pack up your alls and begone. Why ſo? Becauſe the Romiſh church forbids marriage and commands an abſtinence from meats. Yet, ſtrange to tell, this Romiſh church, that forbids marriage, calls matrimony a ſacrament of divine inſtitution, and Romaniſts, in preſence of her miniſters, contract marriages with great ſolemnity. She orders alſo an abſtinence from meats at certain times, but never as if they were unclean, hence her children eat all ſorts of meat with thankſgiving; they think with the apoſtle that every creature of God is good; and have nothing in common with the Manicheans, the anceſtors of this caſtigator, who believed that the evil principle created this viſible world;

world; they think with the Saviour that chaſtity is a virtue lawful and laudable, of which he himſelf and his precurſor John Baptiſt ſet the example; the man who does not believe it, is not a Chriſtian, but a hog of Epicurus' ſty, whatever the caſtigator may think of the matter; they alſo think with the Baptiſt, who abſtained from all ſorts of meat, and with Daniel, who abſtained from meat, from wine, and even from deſirable bread, for three whole weeks, Dan. x, 3, that it is lawful at times, or even at all times to abſtain from certain meats, the man who does not think it, is one of thoſe, of whom the apoſtle ſays. "whoſe end is perdition, whoſe God is their belly," Phil. iii. 19; they think that the apoſtles were juſtified in ordering all Chriſtians to abſtain from blood and animals ſuffocated, or things offered to idols, though all theſe things are God's creatures, and good in themſelves, and finally, they think the Lent, ſo terrible to all the ſons and daughters of Epicurus, wiſely inſtituted by the apoſtles, and religiouſly obſerved by their ſucceſſors, a meaſure well calculated to crucify the fleſh with its paſſions and luſts, Gal. v. 25.

To the proof deduced from St. Paul's firſt epiſtle to Timothy, iii. 14–15, ſtated in the writer's Remarks, which the caſtigator, who fills a volumn with extracts, interſperſed with incoherent reflexions, and coarſe invectives, tranſcribes, replies that the Church of Rome cannot know whether theſe words, "the pillar and ground of truth," be applied to Timothy himſelf, or to the church. Artifice ſuggeſts this ſilly evaſion: for even the ignorance of the caſtigator cannot miſtake the apoſtle's meaning, nor can the efforts of his artifice diſtort them from the intended ſenſe. St. Paul ſays to his diſciple Timothy: "that you may know how to conduct yourſelf in the Houſe of God, which is *etis eſti*, the Church of God, the pillar and ground of truth." This phraſe bears no other ſenſe, but that the Church of God is the pillar and ground of truth. To divert the attention of his readers, and perplex a truth, which he cannot deny, he pretends that the Fathers

thers refer it sometimes to Timothy, and sometimes to the church: Gregory, of Nyssene, says, that "St. Paul fashioned Timothy to be a goodly pillar, making him the pillar and ground of the church and of truth; and Basil said of the deceased bishop of Neocesarea that he was the ornament of the churches, the pillar and ground of truth, a strong and firm establishment of faith in Christ;" and in another epistle, lamenting the state of the church, on account of the dispersion of the bishops by the persecution, Basil says: "The pillars and ground of truth are dispersed"—Ep. 78. Who would think that a pastor of a new church, in which there are no bishops, would presume to inform his readers that the pastors and teachers of the primitive church were bishops? And, what argues the most blind infatuation, he cites from their writings, in opposition to truth, passages which expressly confirm it: Basil calls the bishops "the pillars and ground of truth;" in like manner Gregory calls Timothy an arch-bishop, a pillar of the church and of truth; and the castigator informs us also, that ancient writers were accustomed to call any person eminent in the church by this name, he might have added modern catholic writers to the ancients, their ancestors: there is nothing more common than to call a prelate, eminent for science and sanctity a pillar of the church, or a pillar of truth: because the sanctity of his life justifies the sanctity of that faith, which forms him; and his doctrine condemns the artifices and errors of false teachers; his writings vindicate the truths of religion from misrepresentation and false interpretations, but he cannot prevent them from being distorted: against artful imposture no precaution is proof—the inspired writings are themselves horribly abused. The extracts, which the castigator has injudiciously cited, are manifest allusions to that passage in which St. Paul calls the church the pillar and ground of truth, and shew us that at all times, as well in the primitive as in succeeding ages, the pastors of Christ's Church were thought to be the pillar and ground of truth, and of necessary conse-

quence

quence all teachers in oppoſition to them are the pillar and ground of falſhood.

After this fruitleſs effort, which muſt be aſcribed to the vanity of appearing converſant in the writings of the Fathers, by tranſcribing ſome garbled ſcraps from his repertory, the caſtigator condeſcends to think that Paul's words may be applicable to the church, but they by no means, if we believe him, ſupport infallibility. A plain man would naturally think that the pillar of truth ſupports nothing elſe but truth, for this plain reaſon, that between truth and falſhood there is no mean. If, therefore, the church teaches true doctrine, ſhe ſupports the truth, and is the pillar of truth, if ſhe teaches falſe doctrine, ſhe ſupports falſhood, and is the pillar of falſhood, not of truth. This ſimple reaſoning precludes evaſion, the man is wilfully blind, who does not ſee it, and loſt without redemption if he reſiſts it. The caſtigator aſks on what the church reſts? To which the writer replies, with the apoſtle, it reſts on Jeſus Chriſt, whoſe almighty power preſerves it according to his promiſe: "the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt it;" the truths of his goſpel he teaches by theſe paſtors whom he gives to his church for the work of the miniſtry; by them he detects and confounds the impoſtures of theſe emiſſaries, whom the enemy ſends to ſow tares in his field. "We proteſtants," ſays the caſtigator, p. 177, "believe the truth to be founded on the teſtimony of God." He ſeems to inſinuate that catholics do not believe the truths of religion on the teſtimony of God. The writer begs leave to undeceive his readers: we catholics believe the truths of religion in reality on the teſtimony of God, whilſt proteſtants think they do, but in reality do not: there is this remarkable and eſſential difference between our faith and their opinion, that we have an unerring and abſolute certainty that God has atteſted the truths of religion, and they have none but what they borrow from us. This article has been already diſcuſſed in this work, our caſtigator inadvertently confeſſes it: "the church,"

church," says he, p. 178, "we conceive to be a pillar and ground of truth merely on account of that record, which it bears to the divine testimony." Catholics believe no more: that truth, and that only, is of Catholic faith which is attested by the church to have been revealed by God: it is a gross imposition on the credulity of the public to pretend that the church either supposes, or conceals, or alters any revealed truth; her decisions are solemn declarations that such or such truths are revealed by God, and as truth is not opposite to truth, the contradictory of a revealed truth must be an error. "But," continues the castigator, "though the church may be the pillar and ground of truth, it does not follow that it cannot err, or by erring that it is no longer a church of Christ, but a pillar of falsehood." This jumble of incoherencies he pretends to prove by something more incoherent, or to speak correctly, more blasphemously impious: "*a person*, says he, "*may be a Saint of God, though considerably involved in the pollutions of Sin.*" As *Sin* is a generical term, applicable to all sorts of crimes, and the pollutions of sin unlimited, this Edinburgh castigator assumes, not simply as a truth, but as an unquestionable truth, that is, as a principle of proof, that abominable doctrine, which authorises all sorts of wickedness and crimes in our modern saints: a person may be a saint of God and considerably involved in the pollutions of sin! That is, in other words: a person may be a saint of God and at the same time guilty of perjury, of adultery, of theft, of treason, &c. Husbands take care of your wives, they may be saints of God though considerably involved in the pollutions of sin! It is rather unfortunate that St. Paul did not think these new modelled saints entitled to a share in the inheritance of the kingdom of God.—Eph. v, 5.

The next pages are filled with vague assertions, totally unconnected, without a shadow of proof. The inquisition haunts his affrighted imagination, the thought alarms him, he stares, as a highwayman trembles at the sight

ſight of a rope, or as a fox purſued by a lame or toothleſs hound, though perfectly ſecure, through fear, becomes doubly offenſive; it is true that a preacher who tells his people: that an aſſaſſin, a traitor, a blaſphemer, in a word—"a perſon conſiderably involved in the pollutions of ſin, may be a ſaint of God"—would have ſomething to fear from that tribunal, if within its graſp; but as the inquiſition is no article of catholic doctrine, and neither admired or approved by the writer, he reſigns it to the caſtigator's vengeance—he may vent his rage on it with impunity. From the inquiſition he flies to Epiphanius, the great enemy of images. Why not to Copronymus, of foul memory, he was a greater enemy to images? If the accuſation againſt Epiphanius had been founded in truth, it would prove him an Iconoclaſt, or image breaker, and he would have been anathematiſed by the church as the Iconoclaſts were: other men, more intelligent than he, did not eſcape cenſure when they ſwerved from truth, as Origines, Tertullian, &c. but it would not prove that images were not in the churches objects of reſpect and veneration before his days, in his days, and after them. However, the accuſation is a calumny, though the caſtigator be not the author. St. John of Damaſcus, a celebrated Greek writer, vindicates him from that injurious aſperſion: in his defence of the catholic doctrine againſt the image breakers, this venerable Aſcetick, whom the Greeks conſider as their greateſt writer, ſtates, as a principal univerſally admitted, *that the church cannot err*—preciſely what the caſtigator denies. John Damaſcen then explains, with great preciſion and perſpicuity, the genuine ſenſe of the paſſages in ſcripture, diſtorted by the image breakers in ſupport of their error, juſtifies the church from the imputation of idolatry, with which, calumnious miſrepreſentation then, as now aſperſed it; he replies to a paſſage cited by theſe ſectaries from St. Epiphanius' Letter to John of Jeruſalem; they too knew how to garble and interpolate. In this paſſage Epiphanius is made to ſay: that he tore a curtain on which an image was painted; to this John

Damaſcen replies: if the paſſage be genuine, which he did not ſeem to believe though he did not think proper to conteſt it, Epiphanius muſt have done it to ſuppreſs ſome local abuſe, as Athanaſius ordered the relics of the Saints to be buried, to induce the Egyptians to aboliſh the cuſtom of keeping the dead bodies of their friends on beds in their houſes; but that Epiphanius did not pretend to aboliſh images is manifeſt, ſays he, becauſe they yet embelliſh his own church. A more convincing argument he could not offer. St. Epiphanius' cathedral of Salamine, in the Iſle of Cyprus, was yet in being when John Damaſcen wrote, and the images were there to be ſeen, as they are yet to be ſeen in St. Stephen's Chapel, where the Imperial Parliament meets, if a part of the wainſcot be removed. Damaſcen then cites many paſſages from the earlieſt writers to juſtify the veneration of the images of Chriſt and his Saints; from Denis, the Areopagite; from Baſil; from Gregory of Nyſſa, who ſays that he was affected even to tears at the picture of the ſacrifice of Abraham; from Chryſoſtom, from Leontius, Biſhop of Naples in the Iſland of Cyprus; on this laſt paſſage Damaſcen ſays: "Who is the beſt interpreter of Epiphanius? This holy Biſhop, who preached in the ſame iſland with him? Or they who ſpeak now according to their own opinions?" In the Seventh General Council, 4th Ac. a long paſſage was read, from Leontius' apology for chriſtians, againſt the jews, in which that prelate had ſhewn, with demonſtrative evidence, the eſſential difference between the veneration, which chriſtians pay the images of Jeſus Chriſt and his Saints, and the idolatrous worſhip of the Heathens. In his reply Damaſcen ſays: if Epiphanius had been of the ſame opinion with the Iconoclaſts, his authority could not be of any force againſt the general practice of the church. Damaſcen, ſo celebrated amongſt the Greeks and Latins, thought ſo lightly of the authority of Epiphanius in oppoſition to the eſtabliſhed uſage of the church, that, though he juſtified him from the imputation of hereſy, he did not think it neceſſary to

conteſt

conteſt a manifeſt interpolation in his works; what would he have thought of an apoſtate monk in Saxony, burſting from his monaſtery, diſregarding vows and oaths, and ſetting his wild conjectures in oppoſition to the ſettled doctrines of the chriſtian world? The paſſage in which Epiphanius is made to ſay that he tore the curtain on which the image was painted, is an addition to a letter already finiſhed, and has no reference to the ſubject of that letter, in which the errors of Origines are ſtated, of which John, then Biſhop of Jeruſalem, was ſtrongly ſuſpected—This, and other interpolations in the works of Epiphanius were detected by Epiphanius the Deacon, in the Seventh General Council, Act 6ª: in that Council, compoſed entirely of Greek Prelates, with the exception of the Roman Pontiff's Legates, the artifices of the image breakers were expoſed, and by themſelves acknowledged; the records of the Church of Conſtantinople were produced, in them the eraſures were viſible; ſome paſſages not well effaced were with difficulty rendered intelligible, whole leaves were cut out, all which remained entire in ſome authentic copies, which were alſo produced. Thus it is that error at all times has endeavoured to raiſe itſelf on the ruins of religion, by artifice and impoſture.

As this Edinburgh caſtigator ſeems to place an implicit confidence in St. Epiphanius, he muſt be highly pleaſed at an extract from that Father's works, which are univerſally acknowledged authentic.

At the requeſt of Acacius and Paul, prieſts and archimandrites, that is, ſuperiors of the monaſteries of Carchedonia, and Berea in Syria, whoſe letter is dated in the 92d year of Dioclefian, the 12th of Valentinian and Valens, the 8th of Gratien, that is, the year 375 of our æra, Epiphanius wrote his great work againſt hereſies, which he entitled *Panarian*, or, as he explains it, *Cheſt of Medicines againſt different Poiſons*. In this work are eighty different hereſies ſpecified, and ſolidly refuted. The work is cloſed with an expoſition of the Catholic faith, and a minute deſcription of church diſcipline, which the writer tranſcribes: "Perpetual

" Perpetual continency is by many inviolably obſerved, and honoured; then celibacy; continence in widowhood; the next is a married ſtate principally when not reiterated, though it be allowed to marry after the death of a huſband or a wife. The ſource of all theſe goods is the prieſthood, which is given for the greater part to men of undefiled and perpetual chaſtity, or to them, who live in a ſtate of celibacy, or who abſtain from their wives, or to widowers, who have been once only married; but he, who marries a ſecond time cannot be received into the prieſthood, either in the order of biſhop, of prieſt, of deacon or ſub-deacon. After the prieſthood, is the order of readers, who are admitted indiſcriminately from all States, of perpetual chaſtity, of celibacy, of continence, of widowhood, or marriage, and in caſe of neceſſity from amongſt thoſe, who have contracted a ſecond marriage. There are alſo deaconeſſes appointed for the ſervice of women ſolely; as decency requires on account of baptiſm, and other ſimilar occaſions, they ought alſo to live in a ſtate of continency after one only marriage, or in a ſtate of perpetual virginity; after theſe are the exorciſts, and the interpreters, who tranſlate from one language into another the leſſons or the ſermons; remain yet the *copeats*, ſextons, who bury the dead, and the porters, and all that concerns good order within the church.

" The aſſemblies ordered by the apoſtles are held on Wedneſday, Friday, and Saturday; on Wedneſday and Friday the Faſt continues until *none*, that is until the third hour after mid-day is ended, becauſe on Wedneſday the Lord was betrayed and on Friday he ſuffered. Our Faſt is an acknowledgement that he has ſuffered for us, and a ſatisfaction for our ſins. This Faſt on Wedneſday and until *none*, is obſerved in the Catholic church the whole year, the fifty days in the Eaſter, during which it is forbidden to kneel or faſt, excepted; during that time the aſſembly on Wedneſday and Friday is held in the morning, not at *none*, (three in the evening) as during the reſt of the year; on the day of the Epiphany,

phany, which is the birth of the Saviour, it is not allowed to faſt, though it fall on Wedneſday or Friday. The Aſceticks voluntarily obſerve a faſt the whole year, except Sundays and the Eaſter time, and always obſerve the vigils; the Catholic church reckons all Sundays days of joy, aſſembles on them in the morning and does not faſt; ſhe alſo obſerves the forty days before the ſeven days of Eaſter in a continued faſt; but ſhe does not faſt on Sundays even in Lent; as to the ſix days before Eaſter-Day, all the people live on dry food, ("*xerophagia*") that is, taking but bread, and ſalt and water, in the evening; the moſt fervent paſs ſometimes two days, ſometimes three or four without eating, and ſome the whole week until Sunday morning at cock crow; vigils are obſerved theſe ſix days, and there is an aſſembly every day; during the Lent alſo the aſſembly is held from *none* to evening. In ſome places the vigil is kept on the night of Thurſday until Friday, or of Sunday only. In ſome places the ſacrifice is offered on Holy Thurſday, continuing the "*xerophagia*," dry food; in other places the ſacrifice is celebrated but on the night of Sunday, ſo that the office finiſhes at cock-crow on Eaſter Day. Baptiſm and the other myſteries are celebrated according to the tradition of the goſpel and of the apoſtles.

"A commemoration of the dead is made, naming them by their names, celebrating the prayer and the ſacrifice; morning prayers in the church are always with canticles and praiſes, and evening prayers with pſalms. There are monks who dwell in cities, and ſome who dwell in monaſteries, far diſtant from cities; ſome, who wear long hair through devotion, but that practice is not conformable to the precept of St. Paul; there are many other particular devotions obſerved in the church, as to abſtain from the fleſh of all ſorts of animals, from eggs, and from cheeſe; ſome abſtain from four-footed animals, others retrench fowl alſo, and ſome retrench even fiſh, others eggs and ſome cheeſe, and there are ſome, who abſtain

abſtain from bread and fruits, and every thing dreſſed at the fire; many ſleep on the bare ground, many go bare-foot, ſome wear a hair cloth concealed, it is indecent to expoſe it to view, or to carry a chain on the neck as ſome do. A great number abſtain from the bath, and ſome, having renounced the world, invent ſimple and eaſy mechanical arts to baniſh idleneſs, and live without being expenſive to others. A great number are continually employed in pſalmody, in prayer, in reading or reciting the ſcriptures.

"The catholic church teaches to all the fruits of hoſpitality, of alms, and all works of charity towards others; ſhe abſtains from the communion of all ſectaries, baniſhes fornication, adultery, uncleanneſs, idolatry, murder, and all ſorts of crimes, magic, aſtrology, divinations, poiſonings, enchantments, &c. ſhe forbids the theatres, horſe races, the combats of beaſts, muſical ſhows, all ſorts of ſlander, quarrels and diſputes, injuſtices, avarice, uſury; it does not approve traders, places them in the laſt rank of all, and does not receive the offerings but of thoſe, who live according to juſtice."

What does the Edinburgh caſtigator think of this picture of the primitive church, of which he ſays proteſtants have re-aſſumed the form? Can he diſcover his new modelled church in the picture? Is there any one feature of reſemblance? The epicurean devotion, of eating all ſorts of meat indiſcriminately on all days, was not yet known in the church; nor was that new modelled virtue, of propagating the human ſpecies, a neceſſary accompliſhment in its miniſters. What a catalogue of popiſh ſuperſtitions, and unprofitable auſterities Epiphanius gives!

In the ſame page, 170, the caſtigator cites a long paſſage from Paul's epiſtle to the Romans, xi, the concluſion of which, "thou alſo ſhall be cut off," he applies to the Roman Church, he only omits to inform his readers that the apoſtle did not addreſs theſe words to the Roman church, or to any other church; but to the

Gentile

Gentile converts, who preferred themſelves to the Jews; in the preceding chapter the apoſtle had corrected a prevailing error amongſt the Jews, who preferred themſelves to the Gentiles, and thought the promiſed Salvation confined to themſelves; he had ſhewn them from the prophets, that the vocation of the Gentiles had been predicted; that the Jew and the Greek are equally juſtified by faith in Jeſus Chriſt, not by the works of the Jewiſh law; in the 11th chapter he corrects the preſumption of the Gentiles, who thought that the Jews had been reprobated, and they themſelves ſubſtituted. "Has God," ſays the apoſtle, "caſt away his people? God forbid: for I am myſelf an Iſraelite of the ſeed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin..... I ſpeak to you Gentiles..... if ſome of the branches be broken off, and thou being a wild olive wert grafted in amongſt them, and with them partakeſt of the root and fatneſs of the olive tree, boaſt not againſt the branches; but if thou boaſt, thou beareſt not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt ſay then: the branches were broken off that I might be grafted in. Well, becauſe of incredulity they were broken off, and thou ſtandeſt by faith. Be not high minded but fear: for if God ſpared not the natural branches, perhaps he would not ſpare thee: behold, therefore, the goodneſs and ſeverity of God; ſeverity on them who fell, but goodneſs towards thee, if thou continue in goodneſs, *if not thou alſo wilt be cut off*, and they alſo if they do not perſiſt in incredulity will be grafted in: for God is able to graft them in again." Who would imagine that the menace, "*thou alſo wilt be cut off*," was addreſſed to the Church of Rome or to any other Church, if this caſtigator's familiar ſpirit had not diſcovered it? A plain man would apply the menace to himſelf, and from it conclude the neceſſity of working his ſalvation with fear and trembling, a doctrine which the apoſtle teaches with great preciſion in his epiſtle to the Philippians, ii, 12—"Wherefore, my beloved, as you have always obeyed me, not only when preſent, but much more now when

when abſent, *with fear and trembling work your ſalvation—meta phobou kai tromou tēn èauton ſoterian katergazeſthe.*

In the paſſage garbled by the caſtigator, and the context, which determines the ſenſe, artfully omitted, the apoſtle, ſo far from menacing the church with ruin, expreſsly teaches its perpetual ſtability: though many branches are occaſionally broken off, and others engrafted amongſt the remaining branches, the ſtock remains entire; and will continue entire until the conſummation: the apoſtle continues ſpeaking to the converts from the heathen nations: "For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree, which is by nature wild, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree, how much more ſhall they, who are according to nature, be engrafted in their own olive tree? For I would not, brethren, have you not know this myſtery, (that you be not wiſe in yourſelves) that blindneſs in part is effected in Iſrael until the plenitude of nations come in, and ſo all Iſrael ſhall be ſaved"—xi, 24-25. The ſtock, therefore, if we believe the apoſtle, will continue entire until the Jews are engrafted, after the plenitude of nations be come in. Quere: does this Edinburgh Caſtigator think, that the plenitude of nations are, have been, or ever will be, within the pale of his little church? If not, it is not that ſtock of which the apoſtle ſpeaks.

He then proceeds to tranſcribe, from his repertory, extracts, garbled from the works of incorrect or fanatical writers, which have been cenſured by the church, amongſt theſe we find Occam, a fanatical admirer of Lewis of Bavaria, cenſured for his extravagant opinions, which, however, he retracted, and was, in conſequence, abſolved from cenſures—ſee his life, Hiſt. de Gran. And Weſſelus, Luther's precurſor, whoſe works were burned. Of this laſt writer, the caſtigator ſays, with his accuſtomed veracity: "*a man highly eſteemed in the Church of Rome*"—p. 182. So highly eſteemed that his works were burned by the common hangman—ſee his hiſtory, *ibid.* The ravings of theſe men, ſimilar to his own, the caſtigator gives his

his readers, as doctrines taught in the church of Rome. As their errors were refuted long before the caſtigator was born the writer paſſes them unnoticed. He then gives, what he calls, ſpecimens of morality taught in the church of Rome. It is amuſing to hear a man ſpeak of morality who tells his readers that *they may be Saints of God though conſiderably involved in the pollutions of Sin.* However, theſe ſpecimens, which he gives, are doctrines condemned by the church of Rome, which he impudently calumniates, the author of his repertory found them not in the works of theſe voluminous writers, which, in all appearance, he never read, but in the cenſure which is always paſſed on the extravagant opinions of catholic writers by the church of Rome, as modern ſceptics find the objections, which they propoſe againſt different paſſages of ſcripture, not in the ſcriptures, of which they know nothing, but in the works of chriſtian writers, who accurately diſcuſs all ſeeming difficulties in order to elucidate the truth: our caſtigator, not ſo cautious as his brethren, modern ſceptics, inadvertently refutes himſelf: that many individuals of the Romiſh Communion, have exalted notions of the precepts of religion, p. 186. If he could diſmiſs that lying ſpirit which miſleads him, and conſult common ſenſe, he would have known that all the individuals, who compoſe that immenſe body the catholic church, or, as he calls it, the Romiſh church, learn, the maxims of morality as well as the doctrines of faith from their paſtors, whoſe official duty it is to explain them, as this caſtigator's congregation learn Calvin's opinions from his inſtructions. If therefore they have pure and exalted views of the precepts of religion, it is becauſe the maxims of morality taught in the church are pure and exalted. The man who aſſerts the contrary does not know the morality of the church, or he does not know the truth.

Page 187, contains a greater number of groundleſs aſſertions than the writer remembers to have ſeen crowded into the ſame ſpace, ſome are impudently ca-

lumnious, as that Liberius declared himself an Arian, and cursed the doctrine of the scriptures, with some others, which have been already refuted. As they are all mere vague assertions, without a shadow of proof, they are passed unnoticed.

This Edinburgh castigator seems to think, confidence in assertion, a substitute to truth. The infallibility of decision, which he denies to the church of Jesus Christ, he assumes, modesty is not in the catalogue of new modelled virtues: it is the accompaniment of real science, the irreconcileable enemy of assuming ignorance; hence we find truth diminish in the castigator's assertions, in proportion as his confidence swells, as if it fled from arrogance: "the fathers," he says, p. 188, "were utter strangers to the pretensions of the Romish church, and knew of no infallibility beyond the testimony of God in the scriptures." The fathers, it is true, believed no revealed truths but on the testimony of God, as we catholics do now. This is an invariable rule, but that these truths were attested by God, they believed on the testimony of his church, as we do, this rule is equally invariable: for the fathers were not all immediately inspired, nor had they our castigator's spirit of divination to instruct them. If by the pretensions of the Romish church, the doctrine of infallibility, of indefectibility, and perpetual visibility, be understood, the fathers were not strangers to these pretensions; they knew them, and if the castigator does not know this, it is because he knows nothing of the works of these venerable writers but the few garbled extracts, which are found in Illyricus' *Catalogue of Witnesses*. Assuming the visibility, the veracity and the universality, of the church as a principle of proof, St. Austin demonstrates the truth of the christian religion. Does the castigator think this father was an utter stranger to a doctrine on which he founds a proof of christianity? "If we say to a heathen, believe Jesus Christ because he is God, and he replies: why believe him? when we produce the authority of the prophets; and he says that

he

he does not believe them, becauſe they are Hebrews and he a Heathen. From the future events, which they foretold, and are now ſeen to have happened, we ſhew the veracity of the prophets. I believe he would be moved when he would hear many things from the prophets . . . . when he would ſee the kings of the earth advantageouſly ſubject to Chriſt's dominion, and all nations ſerving him; when what has been ſo long ago foretold, is read to him from Ps. lxxi. ii, all the kings of the earth ſhall adore him, *all nations ſhall ſerve him* . . . . When he conſiders what things are there foretold of Chriſt, *and what of his church*, and ſees fulfilled in the whole world, what he there read foretold,"—Lib. 13. Cont. Faus. Ca. 7. But if this Heathen be moved that they who are called Chriſtians are divided into many different ſects; we ſhew that even this has not been omitted by the prophets,—Cap. 12.

If he ſhould ſay, and enquire as one, whom we catechiſe, by what manifeſt ſign, ſhall I, as yet a child, and unable to diſtinguiſh clear truth from ſo many errors; by what manifeſt ſign ſhall I hold the Church of Chriſt? The prophet teaches him that, *that is the Church of Chriſt predicted, which ſhows itſelf above all others and appears* . . . . as it is the city built on the mountain, what mountain if not that, which according to the prophecy of Daniel ii, 35, from a little ſtone increaſed, and is become a great mountain ſo that it fills the whole earth, *Cap.* 13, and, in his book on the belief of things which are not ſeen, Auſtin ſays: "they are greatly deceived who think that we believe in Chriſt without aſſurances: for what aſſurances can be more evident than theſe, which we ſee foretold and fulfilled, you, then, who think there are not aſſurances why you ought to believe of Chriſt things which you have not ſeen, *attend to what you ſee. Behold in Chriſt, that is, in the ſeed of Abraham, all nations are bleſſed*, you ſee it and are amazed," *cap.* 3. *n.* 5. He adds, *cap.* 4. *n.* 7, attend to me, the church ſays to you (the Heathens) attend to me, whom you ſee, though you be unwilling

ling to see: the faithful who were in the land of Judea, then present, learned the facts which then happened, the wonderful Nativity, the Passion, the Resurrection, the Ascension of Christ, all his divine words and actions. These things you have not seen, and therefore you refuse to believe. But look on this; reflect on what you see, not on what you are told is past, or on what you are forewarned is to come, but on what is now shewn present. . . . You have not seen what is predicted, (Isaiah vii. 14) '*Behold a Virgin will conceive and bring forth a Son*;' but you see what was predicted to Abraham, (Gen. xxii. 18) the word of God, and fulfilled "*in thy seed all nations shall be blessed*; you have not seen what was predicted of the wonderful works of Christ,—Ps. xlv, 9, "*Come and see the works of the Lord, the prodigies which he has placed on the earth*, but you see what was predicted, (Ps. ii, 7–8) "*The Lord said to me, thou art my Son . . . . . ask thou of me, and I will give thee nations an inheritance, and the bounds of the earth a possession.*" All the mysteries of religion, as well the past, that is, the Birth, the Death, the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ, as the future, that is, the last Judgment, the Resurrection of the Dead, the Pains of the Damned, and the Glory of the Just, St. Austin demonstrates to the Heathens on this one principle, that these mysteries are predicted in the same scriptures, in which the church is predicted, catholic, visible, and perpetually existing, and as these predictions of the church, are undeniably verified, he concludes that the other mysteries are equally true. Thus he proceeds in his demonstration, Ch. 5, n. 8: "As the intentions of friends which cannot be seen are believed on the signs which indicate them, so the church, *which is now seen*, of all those things, which are not seen, but are shewn predicted in the same writings in which the church is itself predicted, is the index of the past, and fore-teller of the future." St. Austin's argument is now, as it was then, of irresistible force. If we believe this Edinburgh Castigator, he, and all the Fathers

thers were utter ſtrangers to theſe pretenſions of the church. How miſerably his ſpirit of divination deceives this caſtigating paſtor! St. Auſtin was no ſtranger to the pretenſions even of his new-modelled church: there were many of them in his days, and he knew how to diſtinguiſh them from the Church of Chriſt, on the ſtability and univerſality of which he founded his demonſtration of chriſtianity againſt the heathens. His diſcourſe on paſtors is now before the writer, from it he makes a few extracts for the ſatisfaction of this caſtigating paſtor—the venerable prelate cites theſe words from Ezekiel xxxiv: "My ſheep ſtray on every mountain, and on every elevated hill, and on the face of the whole earth my ſheep are ſcattered." From theſe he concludes: "the ſheep are ſtraying on the whole face of the earth, not that *all ſectaries* are on the whole face of the earth, but yet there are *ſectaries* on the whole face of the earth: *ſome here, ſome there*, from no place are they excluded, they do not know each the other. There is one ſect in Africa, another in the Eaſt, one in Egypt, another in Meſopotamia, for inſtance—in different places, they are different, but it is the ſame mother Pride, which brought forth them all, as it is our one Catholic mother, which gives birth to all Chriſtians diſperſed in the whole world: it is not ſurpriſing that pride ſhould give birth to diſſention, and charity to union, yet the Catholic mother, and the great paſtor, by her miniſtry, every where ſeeks the wandering ſheep; ſtrengthens the weak; cures the languid; binds up the broken, ſome from theſe, ſome from thoſe, who do not know each the other, but the catholic mother knows them all, becauſe ſhe is diffuſed with them all. Thus, for inſtance: the ſect of Donatus is in Africa, the Eunomians are not in Africa, but the catholic mother is here; the Eunomians are in the Eaſt, the ſect of Donatus is not there, but the catholic church is there with the Eunomians, the catholic church, is like the vine encreaſing, in all places diffuſed, they, are like the uſeleſs branches lopped off by the cultivator's pruning knife,

on

on account of their barrenneſs, that the vine may be cleared, not that it might be cut down. Where theſe branches are lopped there they remain, but the vine knows its own branches, which remain in it, and the branches lopped off, which remain by it, from thence ſhe recals the wandering; becauſe, of theſe broken branches, ſays the apoſtle, God is able to engraft them again; whether you ſay ſheep ſtraying from the flock, or branches lopped from the vine: for God is not leſs capable of recalling the ſtraying ſheep, than of engrafting again the lopped branches, becauſe he is the chief ſhepherd and the ſovereign cultivator."

After ſome ſevere ſtrictures on theſe paſtors, through whoſe neglect the ſheep ſtray from the fold, and on theſe, who neglect to recall the ſtray ſheep, Auſtin ſays: "if a biſhop, conſtituted in the Catholic church, does not give a good account of the ſheep, when he does not recall one, that ſtrays from the flock of God, what account will the Acatholic give, who not only does not recall from error, but forces the ſheep into it?"

As the Donatiſts, againſt whom St. Auſtin reaſoned more particularly, pretended that the ſacraments were not validly adminiſtered but by paſtors exempt from ſin, he proves both from the old and new teſtament that it is Chriſt himſelf, who feeds his flock by the miniſtry of their paſtors, of courſe that the validity of the ſacraments is totally independent on the good or bad qualities, the virtues or the vices of the miniſters. The Lord ſays by the prophet Ezekiel, xxxiv, 10: "*Behold I to the paſtors, and I will ſeek my ſheep from their hands, and I will make them to ceaſe from feeding the ſheep.*" Auſtin remarks, that when God ſaid he would diſmiſs the paſtors of the Jewiſh church from the care of his flock, reproaching them with their neglect, he did not ſay: "I will conſtitute other good ſhepherds, who will attend to theſe duties, which you have omitted; but he ſays: I myſelf will feed my ſheep: I will commit them to no other: you my brethren, you the ſheep are ſafe, we

(the

(the ſhepherds) may have ſome reaſon to fear." From the old teſtament Auſtin deſcends to the new: he cites theſe words from John x. 27. "The ſheep, which are mine, hear my voice, and follow me." Here, continues Auſtin, I find all good paſtors in one paſtor, not that good paſtors are wanted, but they are in one, they who are divided are many, but here one is announced becauſe unity is recommended. The paſtors are not unnoticed, and one paſtor only mentioned, becauſe the Lord does not find a perſon, to whom he would entruſt his ſheep, and then entruſted them, becauſe he found Peter, in Peter himſelf he recommends unity: there were many apoſtles, to one only is ſaid: feed my ſheep. Far be it from us to think that there are no good paſtors now; far be it from us; far be it from the mercy of him who begets and conſtitutes them. If there be good ſheep there are alſo good ſhepherds, for of the good ſheep, the good ſhepherds are made; but all good ſhepherds are in one, are one *unum ſunt*, they feed, Chriſt feeds, the friends of the bridegroom, do not ſpeak their own word: they rejoice becauſe of the voice of the bridegroom. He himſelf then feeds when they feed. He ſays: *I feed*, becauſe in them is his word, in them is his charity, and Peter himſelf, to whom he entruſted his ſheep, as one to another "*quaſi alter alteri*" he willed to make one with himſelf, that he might thus entruſt his ſheep to him; that he might be the *head*, that he might bear the figure of the church, and that, as the bridegroom and the ſpouſe, they might be two in one fleſh . . . . . Let them (the Donatiſts) ſpeak their own word; let us ſee if it be the word of Chriſt; if it be the voice of the ſhepherd, whom the ſheep follow; whether the word be ſpoken by a good man, or a bad man, is it the word of Chriſt? The ſtray ſheep ſeeks the fold. You ſay the church is of the party of Donatus, I want the word of the ſhepherd. Read me this from the prophet, from the pſalm, from the law, from the goſpel, from the apoſtle: from all theſe I read *the church diffuſed all over*

the

the world, and the Lord ſaying, *the ſheep, which are mine, hear my voice, and follow me.* What is the voice of the ſhepherd? "*There will be preached in his name repentance and remiſſion of ſins through all nations, beginning from Jeruſalem*, Luke xxiv. This is the voice of the ſhepherd; attend to it, and follow it, if you be a ſheep."

The Donatiſts affected to juſtify their ſchiſm on the pretence, that the ordination of Cecilian, biſhop of Carthage, was null, becauſe he had been ordained by Felix, biſhop of Aptung, who had, as they pretended, given up the ſcriptures in the perſecution; and as the Roman pontiff Melchiades, or, as he is ſometimes called, Miltiades, had, in a council at Rome, declared the ordination of Cecilian valid, without inquiring whether Felix had, or had not given up the ſcriptures, a queſtion of fact, difficult, if not impoſſible to determine; the Donatiſts ſeparated themſelves from the communion of the pope, and of the catholic church, which he then governed; to ſhew the folly of this pretence, St. Auſtin continues: "But theſe men gave up the books; and thoſe again offered incenſe to idols; this man, and that man; what do you tell me of this man and that man? If they done ſo, they are not paſtors; but let me hear the voice of the ſhepherd, you do not ſpeak the word of the ſhepherd of theſe men: you neither produce the goſpel, nor the prophet, nor the apoſtle, who ſpeaks of this, or that man, theſe I believe of him; others I do not believe. You produce acts, (the depoſitions of witneſſes againſt Cecilian) ſo do I, (depoſitions in his favour) let us believe yours, do you believe mine; I do not belive your's; do not you believe mine; let theſe papers be removed; let us hear the Divine words, produce me one word of ſcripture for the party of Donatus; hear innumerable for the whole world. Who can ennumerate them? However, let us enumerate a few: the firſt covenant of God: "*in thy ſeed ſhall all nations be bleſſed* —(Gen. xxii, 18); in the Pſalm (ii. 8) *aſk thou of me and I will give thee nations thy inheritance, and thy poſſeſſion*

the

the boundaries of the earth; all the extremities of the earth will remember and will be converted to the Lord (Ps. xxi, 28;) *and all the kindreds of nations will adore in his presence; for the kingdom is the Lord's, and he will reign over nations*—(ibid;) *ſing to the Lord a new ſong, let the whole earth ſing to the Lord*—(Ps. xcv, 1;) *and all kings ſhall adore him; all nations ſhall ſerve him*—(Ps. lxxi, 11.) Who is able to enumerate them all? Almoſt every page ſounds nothing elſe but Chriſt and his church diffuſed in the whole world. Let me now have one word produced for the party of Donatus. Is it a great thing, which I aſk? They ſay the church diffuſed in the world is to periſh. Is it to periſh by ſo many teſtimonies predicted to continue? That word is not from the law, nor from the prophets, nor from the canticles of the ſhepherd: hear the voice of the word (Jeſus Chriſt) from the mouth of the word (of Jeſus Chriſt,) admiring the faith of the Centurion, he ſaid: "*I ſay unto you I have not found ſo great faith in Iſrael; wherefore I ſay unto you that many will come from the Eaſt, and from the Weſt, and ſit down with Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob in the kingdom of Heaven*"—(Luke xiii, 29.) From the Eaſt *many*, and from the Weſt *many*: behold the church of Chriſt! Behold the flock of Chriſt! See if you be a ſheep, the flock, which is every where, cannot be concealed from you; you will have no reply to make to your Judge, whom you do not deſire to be your. Shepherd, you will, I ſay, have nothing to reply, I did not know, I did not ſee, I did not hear. Why is it that you did not know? There is no one, who conceals himſelf from his heat. Why is it that you did not ſee? All the boundaries of the earth have ſeen the ſalvation of our God. Why is it that you did not hear? Their ſound is gone out into the whole earth; and their words to the extremities of the earth" . . . . .

What does our Edinburgh caſtigator think of this reaſoning? Is it concluſive? Or is it not? If it be, what a melancholy proſpect before him! If it be not, their is no truth in man: for never was reaſoning of more ir-

 reſiſtible

reſiſtible force, more impreſſive evidence, or more univerſally applicable. The caſtigator ſays this pope was a wicked man; that other pope curſed the doctrine of the ſcriptures; the popiſh clergy are corrupt; papiſts diſregard oaths, &c. To all theſe accuſations Auſtin replies: is that the voice of the ſhepherd, whom the ſheep follow? In what book of the ſcriptures do you read it? This is the voice of the ſhepherd: "*obey your guides and be ſubject to them, for they watch over your ſouls as being to give an account,*"—Heb. xiii, 17. Theſe virulent invectives with which the caſtigator feeds his flock, are not found in the ſcriptures; they are his own words, not the voice of the ſhepherd, who ſays: "*the ſheep, which are mine, hear my voice, and follow me,*"—John x.—See St. Auſtin's reply to the accuſations againſt the popes Marcellinus, Marcellus, Sylveſter, Melchiades, &c.—Review, p. 74.

In paſſages which he cites from Athanaſius, Auſtin, and Jerom, or rather which he tranſcribes from his repertory, the caſtigator's ſpirit of divination diſcovers that theſe Fathers knew nothing of the infallibility of the church. Athanaſius ſays, what no Catholic ever denied or doubted, "that we ought to pray for the ſpirit of diſcretion, that every one may know what to receive and what to reject: a faithful diſciple of the goſpel is able to diſtinguiſh between truth and pretence, becauſe he has the ſpirit of diſcerning, but the ſimple is carried away by every colour." What then? Is it not the ſpirit of diſcretion, which enables the illiterate mechanic to diſtinguiſh between the true paſtor of the church, from whom he learns the truth, and who feeds him with the word of Chriſt, from the falſe teacher, from whom he hears nothing but pretence, and who feeds him with his own words, as this caſtigator and his aſſociates feed their diſciples with the tales of wicked popes, and wicked biſhops, &c of which there is not a word in the ſcriptures. Is it not to prevent the ſimple from being carried away by every *colour*, or, as St. Paul expreſſes it, by every

every *wind* of doctrine, that Chriſt gives paſtors and teachers to his church? Eph. iv. Athanaſius believed the church infallible in her doctrinal deciſions, as did Auſtin and Jerom, as all Catholics do, and always did; in his letter to Epictetus, cited by Epiphanius, Her. 77, he expreſſed his ſurpriſe that they would move any queſtion on matters decided in the Council of Nice, the decrees of which could not be changed without error; and in his treatiſe on Synods, having ſhewn that the Synods of Selucia and Rimini had been aſſembled by the intrigues of the Arians, under pretence of eſtabliſhing the faith of Jeſus Chriſt, but in reality in order to ſubvert the definition of the Council of Nice, after which there is nothing more to be examined. He therefore thought the deciſion of Nice final, of infallible authority, otherwiſe it would have been ſubject to examination; and Auſtin ſays, Ep 162, that the laſt judgment of the church is a general council. The caſtigator finds in his repertory a garbled paſſage from Auſtin's works, which in the ſenſe intended by that prelate is ſtrictly true, but no more to the caſtigator's purpoſe than the former, "the church," ſays Auſtin, "ought not to ſet herſelf above Chriſt, [who ever doubted it?] for he always judges according to truth; but eccleſiaſtical Judges, being men, are frequently miſtaken." The caſtigator's familiar ſpirit forgot to inform him, that St. Auſtin did not ſpeak of doctrinal deciſions, but of perſonal crimes, which are proved by the depoſition of witneſſes, the truth or falſhood of which is not, nor cannot be known to the eccleſiaſtical Judge; "from this cenſure," continues the caſtigator, p. 189, "Auſtin does not even exclude general councils," nor does this writer: for in perſonal crimes, ſuch as the fact then in diſpute, whether Felix of Aptung, or Cecilian of Carthage, or even the pope Melchiades had given up the ſcriptures or not, the church claims no infallibility of deciſion, for the reaſon already aſſigned, ſuch facts are no parts of the depoſite of faith; no part of that doctrine, with which Chriſt feeds

feeds his ſheep by the miniſtry of his church : no Catholic is obliged to know that ever ſuch men exiſted ; but when St. Auſtin ſpeaks of doctrinal deciſions, he ſays the judgment of a general council is the laſt, it is ſubject to no change. Thus, in his 3d. B. againſt Maximinus, cap. 14, he ſays : " this is that '*homoouſion*,' ('*conſubſtantiality*') which, in the council of Nice, againſt the Arian heretics, was, by the catholic fathers, confirmed by *the truth of authority, and the authority of truth.*" So univerſally was it believed that the deciſion of a general council, on any doctrinal queſtion, was final and of infallible authority, that it was inſerted amongſt the laws of the empire by the emperor Martianus. *L. Nemo. C. de ſummatrinitate & fide catholica.* The caſtigator inadvertently informs his diſciples that in the primitive chriſtian church there were eccleſiaſtical Judges ; theſe eccleſiaſtics were veſted with ſome ſpiritual authority, they exerciſed ſome ſpiritual juriſdiction : for a Judge without authority or juriſdiction is an exotick ; it may perhaps be found in the regions of new modelled fancy. Is it a chriſtian church in which there is no eccleſiaſtical Judge ? no ſpiritual authority or juriſdiction ? The caſtigator, who is never weary of tranſcribing, adds another paſſage from St. Auſtin, in which that Father ſays, " that he learned to pay that deference to the canonical ſcriptures of believing their authors to have erred in nothing ; but others, though ever ſo learned or holy, he read ſo as not to take any thing to be true, becauſe they were of that opinion, but becauſe they proved it by reaſon or ſcripture." What is this to the purpoſe ? Who ever thought any writer, not divinely inſpired, infallible ? Though we, catholics, pay the greateſt deference to Auſtin's authority, we do not believe himſelf infallible ; ſome of his opinions we reject. In matters of opinion, of which St. Auſtin ſpoke, a wiſe man will adopt that which ſeems to him moſt conſonant to ſcripture and to reaſon ; doctrines of faith, which this caſtigator ignorantly confounds with opinion, the catholic believes on the authority of revela-

tion,

tion, and that such doctrines have been revealed, he knows by the testimony of the pastors of Christ's church, by whose ministry that great shepherd feeds his flock; the sheep which are his, hear his voice, not the idle tales of ranting enthusiasts, of preaching cobblers and tailors, &c. St. Austin, never thought of confounding the doctrines of the church with the opinions of individuals, the latter he says he believed, if proved by scripture or reason; of the former he says: "since, therefore, we see so great protection from God, such progress, such fruit, shall we hesitate to repose ourselves in the bosom of his church, which, even to the confession of mankind, has obtained the summit of authority by the succession of bishops from the apostolical see? Sectaries condemned, partly by the judgment of the people themselves, partly by the weight of councils, partly by the majesty of miracles, in vain bark around; to refuse a pre-eminence to this church, '*cui nolle primas dare*,' is of the most consummate impiety, or precipitous arrogance: for if there be no certain path for souls to wisdom and salvation, but when faith forms them rather than reason, what is it to be ungrateful to the divine assistance and protection, if not to resist with obstinancy the authority predicted? And if every art, however mean or easy, requires a teacher or a master to be understood, what more full of pride than to be unwilling to understand the books of the divine mysteries from their interpreters, or to condemn them not understood?" *Lib. de uti cre. cap.* 17, *n.* 35. Is it this Father who sends the inexperienced youth to fish for tenets of religion in the scriptures? Even the cobbler must have a teacher or a master to understand his art, however simple it may appear, to send him to sound the depths of scripture, in which Austin and Jerom too found great if not insuperable difficulties! The thought is extravagant, it surpasses absurdity: there is something of madness in it.

To shew the profound respect which Austin had for the authority of the church the writer repeats a passage, which

which he has already cited : " the truth of the ſcriptures is obſerved by us when we do that which has pleaſed the whole church, which church the authority of the ſcriptures themſelves commends ; and ſince the holy ſcripture cannot deceive, let whoſoever fears to be deceived, by the obſcurity of this queſtion, conſult the ſame church on it, which the holy ſcripture ſhews without any ambiguity."—*Lib. Con. Creſe. c.* 33, *n.* 39. Auſtin was, therefore, of opinion, that obſcure and difficult queſtions were to be decided by the authority of the church without fear of deception. Is that authority fallible which decides obſcure queſtions without fear of deception ? Was Auſtin an utter ſtranger to the infallible authority of the church? Thus an infatuated populace are duped by impoſture : with unbluſhing confidence they are told that the Fathers are utter ſtrangers to the doctrines, which are found in almoſt every page of their works. Have not all general councils retrenched from the communion of the church the refractory, who refuſed to acquieſce in their deciſions ? Why ſo ? Becauſe it was the ſettled, the eſtabliſhed, the univerſally believed doctrine of the Catholic church, that the deciſion of a general council, at which Chriſt aſſiſts according to his promiſe, *where two or three are aſſembled in my name*, is on every queſtion of faith infallibly certain : for if ever men are aſſembled in the name, that is, by the authority of Jeſus Chriſt, it is when the paſtors of his church are aſſembled to decide on queſtions of faith ; to reſiſt the impetuous fury of ravening wolves, and chaſe the wily foxes from the fold ; and if ever Chriſt feeds his flock by the miniſtry of the paſtors, which he gives to his church, it is when all theſe paſtors unite, and with one voice declare that, ſuch is the doctrine revealed by Chriſt to their predeceſſors, the doctrine tranſmitted to them in regular ſucceſſion, the doctrine they found eſtabliſhed on their acceſſion to the epiſcopal chair : this therefore is the voice of the great ſhepherd ; they who are of his flock hear it and follow him. The caſtigator does

does not hear it. Why so? Because he is not of the flock: "*you do not hear me, said the Saviour to the Jews, because you are not of my sheep.*"—John x, 26. The castigator—a son without a father, a successor without a predecessor—teaches a doctrine, not that which he found on his accession to a vacant chair, for there was no chair vacant for him, but that, which he invented or borrowed from some other, a Luther, or a Calvin, a Brown, or a Whiston, God knows from whom. Is it the voice of the great shepherd? He tells his disciples that the pope is anti-christ, that popish bishops are impostors, that papists are corrupt and bad men, that the church is invisible, that it is subject to error, that it has fallen into ruins, &c. In what book of the scriptures does he read all this? In what scriptures is there one word of it to be found? Is this the voice of the great shepherd? Is it not manifestly the whining of the wolf in sheep's clothing, inveigeing the sheep from the cares of the shepherd? For supposing all these tales of popes and friars as true as many of them are notoriously false, they are not the word of God; it is not the voice of the great shepherd; it is not with such tales that Christ feeds his flock. This is the voice of the shepherd; this is the word from his mouth: "*if he does not hear the church let him be to thee as a heathen.*"—Matt. xviii, 17. If ever the church speaks distinctly, so that her voice cannot be mistaken or misunderstood, it is by the unanimous and united voice of her pastors in council assembled. This also is the voice of the shepherd: "*obey your guides and be subject to them: for they watch over your souls, as being to give an account,*"—Heb. xiii, 17. This also is the word of God: "*the lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law from his mouth.*"—Malachi, ii, 7–8. The castigator corrects this version: "*the lips of the priest,*" he says, "*should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth.*" He is doubly unfortunate: the correction encreases the force of the passage: for *should* or *ought* implies a greater obligation than *shall*

or

or *will*, and attempting to display his erudition, he expo-ſes his ignorance: the terms *jiſhmerou* and *jibakshou* in the original are tranſlated by Jerom "*tuſtodient*" and "*requirent*" "*mephihou*" is not *at his mouth*, but *from his mouth*. The prophet aſſigns the reaſon why the prieſt ought to poſſeſs knowledge, and why the people ought to learn the law from him: "*becauſe he is the meſſenger of the Lord;*" "but," ſays the caſtigator, "the Jewiſh prieſts were wicked men. Some were, it is true, not all: Jeremias and Ezekiel were prieſts, they were not bad men; but whether wicked or not, it is not the leſs true that it is the official duty of the prieſt to teach the people the law, and their indiſpenſible duty to learn the law from him: becauſe, ſays the prophet, "*he is the meſſenger of the Lord.*" becauſe it is by him that God ſpeaks to his people, not by every enthuſiaſt, who is his own meſ-ſenger, who runs without being ſent, who ſpeaks the ravings of his own diſordered brain; as this caſtigating paſtor, who tells his diſciples that all papiſts, of whom he does not perhaps, know an individual, are bad men; let us now ſuppoſe theſe papiſts, whom he ſo piouſly hates and ſo religiouſly calumniates, as wicked as he finds it convenient to repreſent them; who will enſure me that he himſelf is not as wicked as any one of them? He ſays, no doubt, that he is a Saint, and perhaps believes it, ſo did the Phariſee in the goſpel: "*I am not like other men;*" he aſſerts his honeſty and veracity; ſo do thieves before conviction, and ſome even at Tyburn, but let him ſay or believe what he will, this is irreſiſtibly true, that he is not the meſſenger of the Lord, from whom the people are obliged to learn the law; that he is not one of theſe paſtors, by whom Chriſt the great ſhepherd feeds his flock.

When Boſſuet, the celebrated biſhop of Meaux, had collected all the confeſſions of faith publiſhed at differ-ent times by the two grand diviſions of the reformed churches, the firſt, in time, under Luther and his aſſoci-ate Melancton, though the precedence had been diſputed

by

by Zuinglius, who, with Calvin, preſided over the ſecond, with all their ſub-diviſions, which were numerous in their own time, and ſince that time are become innumerable, and had compared theſe confeſſions of faith one with another, and had alſo compared the confeſſion of faith publiſhed on one year with the confeſſion publiſhed by the ſame diviſion on the enſuing year; and had with that preciſion and ſtrength of reaſoning peculiar to himſelf, pointed out all the contradictions, inconſiſtencies and abſurdities, of theſe new-fangled confeſſions of faith, the paſtors of the reformed churches were ſeriouſly alarmed; as he had produced none but the moſt authentic documents, their ſynodical deciſions ſubſcribed by their miniſters, and their catechiſms approved and taught in their churches, all evaſions and ſubterfuges were precluded: the whole of the Reformation became defenceleſs. The immediate conſequence was, that men of information, unprejudiced and diſintereſted, were undeceived, wherever the work got into circulation, and the language in which it was written underſtood. Where intereſt and prejudice unite to warp the underſtanding, truth finds no acceſs; the miracles of Chriſt only ſerved to exaſperate the Phariſees and increaſe their averſion to his perſon; it is not therefore matter of ſurpriſe that the miniſters of the reformed churches were inacceſſible to the truth, though enforced by the perſuaſive eloquence and irreſiſtible reaſoning of a *Boſſuet*. In that alarming criſis they racked imagination to continue the deception, which had formed the party, over which they preſided, with a more abſolute authority, than ever was exerciſed by any one of theſe popes againſt whom they railed inceſſantly. They collected from incorrect writers incoherent opinions, ſome well and ſome ill-founded, not one of which was a doctrine of faith; and ſome opinions from moral writers, which had been cenſured and retracted, or the authors condemned; theſe they artfully confounded with doctrines of faith, to ſhew, as they pretended, that the Catholic church itſelf had varied in its faith; Jurieu went ſome-

thing further: he pretended that the primitive Fathers, whoſe writings have eſcaped the ravages of time, had varied in their doctrine of the Trinity. The illuſion was immediately detected by Boſſuet himſelf, the doctrine of the church juſtified from miſrepreſentation, and ſhewn to have been at all times invariably the ſame. The artifices of Jurieu, Claude and ſome others, produced that inimitable work, *The perpetuity of the Faith*, by Arnaud and Nicole, which was refuted, as uſual, by the moſt ſcurrilous invectives and a torrent of abuſe. From this repertory our Edinburgh caſtigator tranſcribes, and, what they artfully contrived to continue a deception, which had placed them at the head of a party, he obtrudes on the credulity of his admirers, as the fruits of his reſearches in antiquity.

To enable the reader to form a correct idea of an opinion, which Chriſtians are free to adopt or reject, and thereby place the artifice of theſe innovators in a proper light, the writer gives a ſignal inſtance: whether the laſt chapter of Deuteronomy, in which Moſes' death and burial are deſcribed, was written by Moſes himſelf, or added by Joſue, or ſome other writer, is meer matter of opinion, which any man may adopt or reject without the ſuſpicion of hereſy; but if he were to deny that the chapter is divinely inſpired, he would ceaſe to be a Chriſtian. Why ſo? Becauſe it is declared by the authority of the Catholic church to be a part of the ſcriptures divinely inſpired, and entruſted to her care, as is the goſpel of St. John: the certainty of the revelation of both reſts on the ſame authority, the man, therefore, who rejects the one, may alſo reject the other.

The writer gives a ſecond inſtance of an opinion, which, though authoriſed by Auſtin and Jerom and others, no man is obliged to adopt. In the Homily on Paſtors, from which ſome extracts have been already cited, Auſtin ſays: "in the prophet Jeremias, ſome one cries out: *the partridge collects what ſhe did not produce* ..... This partridge, by ſome of our anceſtors, treating

treating on the ſcriptures before us, is underſtood to be the Devil collecting what he has not produced ; for he is not the creator but the deceiver, he collects his riches without diſtinction ; he does not inquire whether a perſon errs in this or that manner, he deſires that all may be deceived, and by all ſorts of errors : how many different ſects there are ! how many different errors ! He does not ſay : they are Donatiſts, not Arians : for whether they be Donatiſts or Arians they are his, who collects without diſtinction : let him adore idols, ſays he, he is mine ; let him perſiſt in the ſuperſtition of the Jews, he is mine, let him, having broken the unity, fall into this or that ſect, he is mine, he collects, therefore, without diſtinction, and makes his riches." Whether by that partridge, which collects the eggs ſhe did not lay, the Demon be underſtood or not, is meer matter of opinion, which, notwithſtanding the authority of Auſtin and Jerom, and theſe more early writers of whom Auſtin ſpeaks, no Catholic is obliged to adopt ; but that a Heathen, a Jew, or a Sectary is not in the catholic communion, is a doctrine of faith. Auſtin does not extend this ſevere cenſure to all Sectaries : he confines it expreſsly to perſons, who, having been catholics, renounce that communion and unite with ſome ſect : " *deſertâ unitate*," he ſays, elſewhere, that they, who ſupport a falſe opinion, without animoſity, diſpoſed to ſubmit to the truth when clearly expoſed, and more particularly if it be an opinion which they receive from their parents, are not to be numbered amongſt Sectaries : of ſuch a perſon Auſtin ſays. B. 4, of Bap. againſt the Don. ch. 16, p. 23 : " this man I do not yet call heretic, unleſs after the doctrine is made manifeſt to him he had rather reſiſt the catholic faith, and chuſe to adhere to what he held . . . . . in him there is only a falſe opinion to be corrected."

The catholic reader is informed that he is not obliged to adopt the opinion of any writer, however great his authority, as a doctrine of faith, if many writers of great

great authority coincide in the ſame opinion, it is raſhneſs, but not hereſy, to contradict it, and argues a fund of pride in the individual, who ſets his own private opinion or the opinion which he borrows from ſome other not better informed than himſelf, in oppoſition to the united opinion of ſo many ſuperior to him, and his teacher, in point of information. If all theſe writers, whom we call Fathers of the Church, or, indeed, all the writers of any age, unanimouſly teach a doctrine, we muſt conclude, that it is the doctrine of the church, which is at all times invariably the ſame: becauſe their united and uncontradicted teſtimony is inconteſtible evidence of the fact, that ſuch was the doctrine then taught; the diſcipline of the church is, and has been in ſome of its parts variable, and adapted to circumſtances, times, places and perſons: thus in the primitive times, the faſt of the Lent was continued until three o'clock in the evening every day, and no collation allowed; now the meal is taken at twelve, or ſome ſhort time before, with a light collation in the evening. If at any time the opinion of an individual be found to deviate from the doctrine univerſally taught, it is a falſe opinion; if obſtinately perſiſted in, and publicly taught, in oppoſition to the ſettled doctrine, it is an heretical opinion; if the author forms a party he becomes the leader of a ſect, is one of theſe falſe teachers, who ſeparates themſelves, whom St. Paul calls heretics.

After citing theſe paſſages from Athanaſius and Auſtin, which ſerve to ſwell the volume, our caſtigator makes an attempt to reaſon. If the church of Chriſt be not deprived of his Divine cares and aſſiſtance, it is not his fault: he moſt anxiouſly deſires it; ſo does that ſpirit of illuſion, which he conſults: "infallibility is claimed," ſays he, p. 190, "by the body of paſtors united with their head." From this principle he concludes, that to preſerve this prerogative in the church, the pope and his clergy ought to be always in Council, *ibid.* The writer gives him credit for this argument: it muſt be

of

of his own invention. How unfortunate it is, that in the only attempt to reaſon, which is found in a number of pages of ſuch profound erudition, the concluſion which he draws is not found even by implication in the principle. For the body of catholic paſtors are not more united with their head in council than out of council; they are at all times equally united with him and with each other, by the profeſſion of the ſame faith, participation of the ſame ſacraments, the ſame hope: that ſociety which we call the Catholic Church is, if St. Paul does not miſtake, *one body*—Eph. iv; animated with one and the ſame ſpirit: "*I will aſk the Father and he will give you another Comforter, that he may remain with you for ever*"—John xiv, 16; in it there is "*one faith*"—Eph. iv; "*one hope*"—ibid; "*one baptiſm*," ibid; it is "*one flock and one Shepherd*"—John x, 16, who does not entruſt his ſheep to the cares of others, but feeds them himſelf: "*I will feed my ſheep*,"—Ezekiel xxxiv, 15. By the miniſtry of theſe paſtors whom he ſends: "*who hears you hears me, and who deſpiſes you deſpiſes me*,"—Luke x, 16, "*behold I am with you all days until the conſummation of the age*,"—Matt. ult. by theſe paſtors, thus united amongſt themſelves, and with their head, the ſupreme paſtor feeds his flock according to his promiſe; hence it follows that if any prelate or paſtor teaches a doctrine of his own invention, or borrowed from the inventor, a doctrine, which he did not find taught in the church, when he became a paſtor, he breaks the unity of faith, the chain of ſucceſſion, is no longer of the number of thoſe paſtors, by whom Chriſt feeds his flock; the inſtant a paſtor ſubſtitutes his own conjectures, or the opinions which he borrows from others, to the ſettled doctrines of the church, in which he was baptiſed, he is a branch lopped from the tree, which cannot produce fruit: there is but the word of God efficacious, he ſubſtitutes his own, which is but an empty ſound.

This union of all the members of Chriſt's church, which has eſcaped the notice of our Edinburgh caſtigator,

was

was known in these turbulent times between the apostle's days and the first general council, when, if we believe this castigator, Christ did not attend to the care of his flock; in those days lived Cyprian, from whose works we find some garbled extracts in the castigator's volume. His testimony, now before the writer, will, no doubt, be highly gratifying to him, he is one of these Popish Fathers, whom he has forced to condemn Popery. In his book on the unity of the church this venerable prelate says: "does he believe that he holds the faith who does not hold this unity? He, who resists the church, who withstands the church, does he think himself in the church? This same truth is taught by the holy apostle Paul: he shews the mystery of unity, saying (Eph iv) *one body and one spirit, one hope of your vocation, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God*, which unity we ought firmly to hold and vindicate, more especially we bishops, *who preside in the church*, [it seems that bishops did preside in the church in them primitive times, at least Cyprian thought so] that we may prove the episcopal order, '*episcopatus*,' one and undivided. Let no man deceive the fraternity by falsehood; let no man corrupt the faith by perfidious prevarication. The episcopal order is one and undivided, of which a part is held by each in its integrity, '*in solidum*.' *The church also is one*, which by the encrease of its fecundity is more widely extended into a multitude; as the rays of the sun are many, and but one light; as the branches of a tree are many, and but one trunk founded in the tenacious root; when from one fountain many streams flow, though from the abundance of the flowing waters numerousness may appear; yet unity is preserved in the source. Separate a ray from the sun, unity does not bear the division of light; break a branch from the tree, it cannot bear fruit; cut off a stream from the spring, it will dry up. Thus the church of the Lord, perfused with light, emits its rays through the whole world, but the light is one, which is in all places diffused; nor is the unity of the body separated; it extends its branches

over

over the whole earth by the abundance of its fruitfulneſs; it plentifully expands its flowing ſtreams all around, but yet there is but one head, one ſource, one mother, abounding in the offspring of its fecundity, by its fruits we are nouriſhed, by its milk we are fed, by its ſpirit we are animated." Why does this Edinburgh caſtigator expreſs ſuch anxiety to remove the Great Shepherd's paſtoral cares from his flock? Is it that he intends to ſubſtitute his own?

In the next page he tells us "that the pope and his clergy may be very wicked men, and therefore, in a moral point of view, very unlikely to enjoy the preſence of Chriſt and his Spirit." He has given ſo many ſpecimens of new-modelled modeſty already, that we muſt ceaſe to admire it. The pope and his clergy, that is, in other words, the whole body of catholic paſtors, a body compoſed of many thouſands, amongſt whom are found the moſt enlightened men on earth, men the moſt eminent for ſcience and piety, may be very wicked men, and very unlikely to enjoy the ſpirit of Chriſt, and this our Edinburgh caſtigator, whoſe knowledge is correſpondent to his modeſty, is the only good man, the only paſtor likely to enjoy the preſence of Chriſt and his divine ſpirit! Are there men ſo infatuated as to be duped by ſuch monſtrous preſumption? The writer replies, that as it is unqueſtionably true that Chriſt, the Great Shepherd, feeds his flock by the miniſtry of theſe paſtors, whom he gives to the church for the work of the miniſtry, for the perfection of the ſaints, not by the miniſtry of theſe paſtors who ſend themſelves, or are ſent by others not better qualified than themſelves, and equally true that, though there may be a bad man amongſt the paſtors of his inſtitution, as there was a Judas amongſt his apoſtles, the whole body is not the leſs under his divine protection, conſequently not the leſs ſound and good. The man who believes, or pretends to believe, that Chriſt gives to his church a wicked body of paſtors for the work of the miniſtry, for the perfection of the

ſaints,

ſaints, (Eph. iv.) either does not believe the truth of his promiſes, or his power of performing them, and conſequently is not a Chriſtian. This ſuppoſition of our Edinburgh caſtigator, only expoſes the weakneſs of his head, or the malignity of his heart, it can neither diſqualify the paſtors of Chriſt's inſtitution from feeding his flock, nor juſtify the intruſion of ſelf-appointed paſtors whom he does not ſend.

In the next page there are aſſertions which the ignorance of this ſcribbler may excuſe, if advanced by a man of real ſcience they have a moſt dangerous tendency, being equally ſubverſive of civil and eccleſiaſtical authority: "it will be granted," ſays he, "that God, who opened the mouth of Balaam's aſs, may at times uſe the agency of very wicked men, and alſo that authority may be connected with many ill qualities." Authority, therefore, may be veſted in a man, who has ſome bad qualities; John Ball, Watt Tyler's chaplain, was of the ſame opinion: he did not think natural qualities, whether good or bad, inconſiſtent with authority, but as ſanctity, in his idea, was the foundation of all authority, he thought, or pretended to think, that ſin was abſolutely incompatible with it, and Watt Tyler, with his army of ſaints, did, in a moſt ſaint-like manner, enforce this doctrine: they diveſted all theſe ſinful magiſtrates and prelates, who fell into their ſanctified hands, of that authority, which of divine right belonged to the ſaints excluſively. Is this Edinburgh caſtigator one of theſe new-modelled ſaints? Is he one of the children of the promiſe, who, yet in the wilderneſs, are deſtined to expel the Canaanites from the land? He admits, it is true, that a wicked man may be a paſſive inſtrument as was Balaam's aſs. Is it that this braying animal from Edinburgh does not know that, between a paſſive inſtrument and a rational agent veſted with active authority there is an eſſential difference? His next aſſertion is more clearly expreſſive of that monſtrous doctrine, which in Tyler's days deluged England with blood, and made

Bohemia

Bohemia a ſlaughter-houſe for more than twenty years —See Review : " this writer," he ſays, p. 192, " ought to recollect that good qualities and authority ought to be *inſeparably* connected in a Chriſtian biſhop." This is worſe than Ball's doctrine : for Ball did not exact good qualities as the foundation of authority, he thought ſanctity, whatever might have been the natural qualities of the mind of the body, ſufficient, nor did he think bad qualities ſufficient to cancel authority : he thought ſin neceſſary for that : thus, for inſtance, iraſcibility is a bad quality, but anger is a ſin. Iraſcibility, in Ball's opinion, did not diveſt either the magiſtrate or the prelate of rightful authority, but anger did. That this caſtigator exacts good qualities as indiſpenſably neceſſary to authority is manifeſt from what he adds by way of proof : " the biſhop," he ſays, " muſt be blameleſs as well as the huſband of one wife." He cannot be underſtood to ſpeak of the biſhop's duty as a Chriſtian : for it is the indiſpenſable duty of every Chriſtian to be blameleſs ; this quality therefore he exacts as being indiſpenſable to his epiſcopal authority. Amongſt theſe good qualities, which he exacts, there is one of late invention, that is, " the biſhop muſt be huſband of one wife." It is perhaps the firſt time that a wife has been numbered amongſt qualities. The writer knows that, in the catalogue of modern virtues, from which modeſty, obedience and chaſtity, have been expunged, as obſolete ; and the propagation of the human ſpecies ſubſtituted, to have one wife, at leaſt, is a virtue ; but, not having this caſtigator's familiar ſpirit to conſult, he did not know that a wife is a good quality : a quality, ſay philoſophers, is that property, either abſolute or relative, which makes the ſubject ſuch or ſuch : thus whiteneſs makes a man white, and blackneſs makes a man black, and a wife makes a man wived ; be it ſo. The biſhop, therefore, muſt be a wived man ; ſo thought a right reverend prelate in former times, if that buſy tattler common fame tell truth ; having loſt a firſt and ſecond loving quality,

knowing that he muſt be a wived man, he applied for a third; but the lady, perhaps not diſpoſed to become one of the caſtigator's qualities, in the common acceptation of terms called wives, or not clearly conceiving the indiſpenſable neceſſity of an old prelate's being wived; or perhaps thinking that a bundle of dry bones, wrapt up in a parchment ſkin, ſhrivelled by the piercing cold of ſeventy hoary winters, could be neither uſeful nor ornamental in her bed chamber, alarmed too at the appearance of a ſkeleton, which, if we may believe a certain writer of no ſmall authority, ſhe miſtook for the ghoſt of her grand-father, modeſtly but peremptorily refuſed to wive him. It is preſumed that the lady, who in point of underſtanding was inferior to few, if any of her cotemporaries, reaſoned in this manner: though it be true that this right reverend prelate muſt be wived, as the precept ſtrictly obliges him, yet there is no precept which obliges me to be his wife, he may therefore be wived by ſome other. The reader will pardon this ſarcaſtical ſtricture when he conſiders that there is ſomething ſo offenſive to common ſenſe, and common decency, in this canting on the neceſſity of propagating the human ſpecies, on the impoſſibility of perpetual chaſtity, &c. with which every paltry ſcribbler ſtuns our ears, that it is irkſome ſeriouſly to refute ſuch a nonſenſical jargon.

The apoſtle Paul, in his 1ſt epiſtle to Timothy, iii. enumerates the qualifications of a man, whom that arch-biſhop might with ſafety inſtitute biſhop of any city, under his juriſdiction, he muſt, ſays the apoſtle, be free from reproach, the huſband of one wife, that is a man who after the death of his wife, or other legal diſſolution of his marriage, did not contract a ſecond marriage. That this is the intended ſenſe of the paſſage is manifeſt, becauſe it was never lawful for a chriſtian to be the huſband of two wives at the ſame time, he might in ſucceſſion, becauſe death diſſolves the matrimonial bond, and the apoſtle did not direct his diſciple to inſtitute a Jew or Heathen biſhop of any city. St. Paul ſufficiently explains

explains himself: for he adds immediately after "*having children*" *tekna echonta*, he does not say "*begetting children*, for that was never allowed in the christian church. The apostles, of whom one or two were married, forsook all things to follow Christ. Behold, said Peter, we have left all things, and followed thee.—Matt. xix, 27. To follow Christ, in the inspired writings, imports neither less nor more than to imitate his virtues, of which chastity was unquestionably one, though, in the opinion of this castigator, it may be antiquated; the apostles therefore did not retain their wives: for wives were not then qualities; they were something more substantial. The apostle Paul was not married, nor were his disciples Timothy, archbishop of Ephesus, and Titus, archbishop of Crete. Of the apostle there can be no doubt: for he himself expressly says it: 1st Cor. vii, after giving some directions for the conduct of married persons, the apostle says: "I say to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they continue as I do; but if they *do not contain* themselves let them marry.—8. Southwell, in that monstrous compilation, which, with unparalelled effrontery, he calls the bible, translates *ei de ouk egkrateuontai* "*if they cannot contain themselves*," substituting his own words to these of the apostle in order to deceive the ignorant, as if there were persons who cannot contain themselves. The original phrase is so simple, so clearly expressed by the apostle, that the most ignorant schoolboy, who knows any thing of Greek, cannot mistake it: that Timothy and Titus were not married is attested by a cotemporary writer, of great authority, Ignatius of Antioch, in his epistle to the Philadelphians.

There is, perhaps, no part of Catholic discipline so offensive to all Reformists as this continency, which the church proposes to her ministers on their admission to holy orders. The discipline itself is not of divine institution: for no such precept is found in the scriptures, nor does tradition attest that any such injunction was given by Christ himself to his ministers; that he approved

proved the diſcipline is certain from his reply to Peter—Matt. xx, 29: "every one, who has forſaken houſes, or brothers, or ſiſters, or father, or mother, or wife, or lands, for ſake of my name, ſhall receive an hundred fold, and inherit eternal life." The wife is found amongſt other things which may be meritoriouſly forſaken to follow Chriſt; but to approve a diſcipline is not to enjoin it; there are many things approved which are not ſtrictly enjoined: this, therefore, cannot be taken as a precept, conſequently the continency of the miniſters of the church is of human, not of divine right. It is of courſe diſpenſable as all human laws may be modified or cancelled by the ſame power which enacts them.

St. Thomas ſays that a vow of continency is annexed to holy orders by a decree of the church *in* 2, 2, *q.* 88, art. 11. Bellarmine thinks that, though this diſcipline be not of divine right, it is of apoſtolical inſtitution. The reaſons which he offers in ſupport of his opinion, if not abſolutely irreſiſtible, are not eaſily eluded. St. Paul, in his epiſtle to Titus, whom he had left at Crete to inſtitute prieſts in the cities of that juriſdiction, enumerating the qualifications pre-requiſite, ſays, of the Biſhop, "he muſt be *ſophròna*," an ambiguous term, which imports *ſobriety*, *prudence*, or *chaſtity*, as the ſubject matter may require. In this place St. Jerom ſays it implies "*cheſtity*," but as *chaſtity* is itſelf an ambiguous term, becauſe there is conjugal chaſtity, as well as virginal chaſtity, the apoſtle corrects the ambiguity by adding the term "*egkrate*," which imports "*continency*," an uncontrouled power over the mind and body. In that phraſe it cannot be underſtood in any other ſenſe: for though it may ſignify "*temperance*" that ſenſe is ſufficiently implied in the term '*ſophróna*,' and would render the term '*egkrate*,' redundant, a defect which is ſeldom if ever found in that apoſtle's writings: he therefore exacts continency in the miniſters of the church.

In his firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians vii, giving inſtructions for the conduct of married perſons, the apoſtle directs

directs them not to defraud each other of their conjugal rights, but requires that they would at certain times restrain themselves, and devote these times to fasting and prayer: but the whole time of the ministers of the church is, or at least ought to be, devoted to fasting and prayer, they are, therefore, by the apostle's directions, at all times excluded from these rights, which are at certain times allowed to others not engaged in the ministry.

In his second epistle to Timothy ii, the apostle says to that prelate: "thou, therefore, endure evil as a good soldier of Jesus Christ: no man, who warreth, entangleth himself in the affairs of life," that is, in temporal concerns: it is needless to say that the man who has a wife and family to provide for, must entangle himself in the concerns of life. This, therefore, is prohibited by the apostle.

Independently on these passages, found in the apostle's writings, which sufficiently explain St. Paul's mind, on the subject, there is a testimony of great weight in support of Bellarmine's opinion. In the Council of Carthage, assembled under the consulship of Valentinian and Neoterius on the 16th of the calends of July, that is, on the 16th of June, 390, at which Genethlius, the archbishop of Carthage, presided, and many bishops from different provinces assisted. The continency of the ministers of the church was said to be of apostolical institution. The second canon of the Council is thus expressed: "*omnibus placet ut Episcopi, Presbyteri, Diaconi, vel qui contrectant Sacramenta, pudicitiæ Custodes etiam ab uxoribus se abstineant, ut quod Apostoli docuerunt et ipsa servavit antiquitas nos quoque custodiamus*," that is, "it is agreed by all, that bishops, priests, and deacons, or they who meddle with the sacraments, the keepers of chastity, abstain even from wives, that *what the apostles taught*, and antiquity itself observed, we also may observe." It was believed by all these venerable prelates assembled from different provinces, that the continency of bishops, priests and deacons, was of apostolical institution. If any thing could add to the force

force of this teſtimony, it is the approbation of the v. of Carthage, in 398, compoſed of 214 Prelates, at which St. Auſtin aſſiſted, the 3d C. is thus conceived: "It is decreed that biſhops, prieſts and deacons, *according to former ſtatutes, abſtain from wives;* if not, let them be removed from the eccleſiaſtical office;" add to this, that the diſcipline, which they ſay antiquity obſerved, is found to have been univerſally obſerved before the Council of Nice; it muſt, therefore, deſcend from the apoſtles according to St. Auſtin's rule: "it is underſtood that theſe things, which though not written we obſerve on tradition, and which are obſerved by the whole world, are ordered by the apoſtles themſelves, or by plenary councils, the authority of which is moſt ſalutary in the church—ad. Jan. Epiſ. 118, c. 1. At the council of Elvira in Spain, which was aſſembled near the cloſe of the Perſecution, under that remorſeleſs tyrant Maximinus, at which Oſius of Cordova, Sabinus of Seville, Flavius of Elvira, Liberius of Merida, Valerius of Saragoſſa, a celebrated confeſſor, with other venerable prelates aſſiſted, it was ordered, Can. 33, that biſhops, prieſts and deacons, and all other clerks engaged in the miniſtry ſhould abſtain from wives.

In the Council of Neoceſerea in Cappadocia, at which Vital, patriarch of Antioch, preſided in the year 314, it was ordered, that if a prieſt preſumed to marry he ſhould be depoſed.—*Can.* 1.

Theſe Councils were celebrated before the Council of Nice, the diſcipline therefore, was not introduced by a General Council. In the Council of Nice the queſtion was not diſcuſſed, but there is a canon which ſuppoſes it to be univerſally obſerved: "the holy ſynod abſolutely forbids the biſhop, prieſt, or deacon to have any woman in his houſe, if it be not a mother, a ſiſter, or an aunt, or ſuch perſons as baniſh every ſuſpicion, *ē à mona proſopa paſan úpopſian diàpepheugen.*"—Can. 3. This canon manifeſtly ſuppoſes the miniſters of the church in a ſtate of continency: for if they were married, the prohibition would

would have been not only uſeleſs but ridiculous, a wife is neither a mother, a ſiſter nor an aunt. To tell a married man that he muſt not have his wife in his houſe ſurpaſſes abſurdity; and where there is a wife, her ſiſters, her maids, her goſſips and viſitants muſt have acceſs.

Hence it appears that Sozomen was miſinformed, when in his hiſtory, written about 236 years after the council of Nice, he ſaid that Paphnutius engaged the prelates there aſſembled, to permit biſhops and prieſts to cohabit with their wives. Such a permiſſion is irreconcilable with their decree. Innocent I. better informed than Sozomen, knew no ſuch permiſſion: In his decretal letter to Victricius, biſhop of Rouen, dated the 15th of the calends of March, under the conſulſhip of Honorius and Ariſteret, that is, the 15th of February, 404, one hundred years before Sozomen was born, and but 69 years after the council of Nice, the pontiff ſays: "the church muſt in all things obſerve that prieſts and levites (deacons) be not carnally united with their wives becauſe they are occupied in the neceſſary works of the daily miniſtry; and it is written 'be you holy becauſe I am holy,'—(Lev. 11) for if in old times the prieſts did not depart from the temple of God during the year of their miniſtry, as we read of Zacharias, (Luke i.) nor did they return at all to their houſe, though, on account of the ſucceſſion, they were permitted to marry, becauſe it was ordered that none ſhould be admitted to the prieſthood but of the deſcendants of Aaron, how much more ſtrictly ſhould theſe prieſts and levites obſerve chaſtity from the day of their ordination, whoſe miniſtry is without ſucceſſion, and no day paſſes on which they are not obliged to attend to the divine ſacrifices or the office of baptiſm." It will be admitted that this pontiff, one of the moſt learned and pious prelates of ancient times, knew the decrees of the council of Nice better than a court lawyer, who gives conjectures founded on vague report. Innocent I. not only atteſts the diſcipline but aſſigns

affigns the motive, and juſtifies it, by the example of the Jewiſh prieſts, who abſtained from their wives during the time of their miniſtry, and the authority of the apoſtle. He thus continues: "for as Paul, writing to the Corinthians, and ſaying, '*abſtain for a time that you may attend to prayer*,' gives this precept to the laity; prieſts, whoſe unremitting duty is to pray, and ſacrifice, ought much more ſtrictly for ever abſtain from ſuch connexion," and Jerom, better informed than Innocent, or, perhaps, than any man of that age, or any other, affigns the ſame reaſon, founded on the ſame authority: "if, ſays he, in his book againſt Jovinian, "a lay-man, or any Chriſtian, cannot pray without abſtaining from the conjugal office, the prieſt, who is obliged at all times to offer ſacrifices for the people, muſt always pray, therefore he muſt always abſtain from marriage."

Leo the Great, in his letter to Anaſtatius, biſhop of Theſſalonica, in the year 445, ſays: "ſo excellent is the deſtination of prieſts, that theſe things, which, in other members of the church, are free from fault, in them are held to be unlawful: for though it be lawful for thoſe, who are not of the clerical order, to engage in marriage and attend to the procreation of children, yet, to ſhew the purity of more perfect chaſtity, the matrimonial connexion is not allowed even to ſub-deacons; that they, who have *(wives)* may be as not having *(them)*, and they who have not, may continue ſingle; but if in this order, the fourth from the head, it be juſt that this be obſerved, how much more ſtrictly ſhould it be obſerved in the firſt, or in the ſecond, or in the third, that no man may be eſteemed worthy of the levitical miniſtry, or the prieſtly honour, or the epiſcopal excellency, who is not known to reſtrain himſelf from the matrimonial enjoyments."

It is therefore true, that before the Council of Nice and after it, biſhops, prieſts and deacons were obliged to perpetual continency. Some did not obſerve the law. True: there are many who tranſgreſs the laws of God and their country,

country, the laws are not the leſs ſtrict, the leſs wiſe, not are they the leſs obliged to obſerve them.

To that paſſage of St. Paul, in which it is ſaid "the biſhop ought to be the huſband of one wife," St. Jerom replied to Jovinian "the epiſcopal election is with one: the apoſtle does not ſay, let a biſhop be choſen, who will marry one wife, and beget children, but let him be choſen, who has had one wife, *mias gunaikos andra*, and who has children ſubject in all diſcipline. Surely you confeſs that he cannot be a biſhop, who begets children from the time of his ordination '*in Epiſcopatu*,' if he be detected he will not be conſidered as a huſband, but condemned as an adulterer . . . . . Huſbands are choſen for the prieſthood, I do not deny, becauſe more prieſts are neceſſary than there are virgins;" that is, men of virginal chaſtity qualified for the prieſthood. In the early ages it was hardly poſſible to find amongſt the converts from the Jewiſh church, or from the heathen ſuperſtition, a ſufficient number of men qualified for the miniſtry, who had lived in a ſtate of continency to the age of thirty, at which the prieſthood was conferred; hence it was not an effect of choice but of indiſpenſable neceſſity, in many places, to aſſume for the miniſtry married men; but the injunction of the apoſtle was ſtrictly obſerved, that they, who were choſen for the miniſtry, had been married but once, and then to a virgin: for he, who, either before or after baptiſm, had been married a ſecond time, or had contracted with a widow, or with a woman known to be corrupted, was excluded from the miniſtry by the apoſtle's rule, as underſtood by the churches, which he himſelf had formed and taught; when a man was choſen, whoſe wife was yet living, both he and ſhe were obliged to promiſe perpetual continency, and ſtrictly to obſerve their promiſe. The huſband from the apoſtolical rule: "The Biſhop muſt be continent—*egkrate*," Tit. i, 8; and the wife by a neceſſary conſequence of the rule; becauſe the huſband could not be admitted to the miniſtry without her conſent; hence if even after the death of her huſband ſhe

presumed to break her vow, she, and the man with whom she contracted a second engagement, were separated or retrenched from the communion of the faithful: in the 1st Council of Orleans, about the year 314. chap. 15, it is ordered: "If a woman, the relict of a priest or deacon, unite in marriage with any other person, let them be separated, and if they persist encreasing the crime let them be excommunicated." And, in the Council of Pope Martin, in the year 572, it is said: If the widow of a bishop, priest or deacon, accept a husband, let her not communicate; when dying the sacraments may be administered to her.

The epicurean doctrine of modern reformists, who think the propagation of the human species a necessary accompaniment of the episcopal dignity, was not yet known to the christian world: the doctrine of St. Paul, who prefers a state of continency to the matrimonial state, in words as clearly expressive as language affords, was thought divinely inspired, and observed with great simplicity—see Review, 158 . . . . where this question is discussed. Vigilantius, a profligate priest of Barcelona, in the beginning of the v. Age; and Jovinian, a more profligate monk, about the same time, undertook to undeceive the world; of the latter Jerom says: "Since he boasts to have been a monk, and from the sable monastic cowl, and sandals, from the measure of bread and water, he has returned to the fashionable dress, all white; to the most excellent wines and best cooked dishes; to the soups of [1]Apitius and [2]Paximus; to the bath; to the pastry cook's shops, and the taverns; is it not manifest that he prefers earth to heaven, vice to virtue, and his belly to Christ?" What, if he had heard the German Apostle preaching to his disciples: "As it is not in my power not to be a man, so it is not in my power to live without a wife, and that is more necessary for me than to eat or to drink, or to satisfy the other necessities of the body

1. A celebrated cook mentioned by Juvenal.
2. A Greek, of great renown amongst Epicureans, mentioned by Suidas.

dy . . . if wives be obſtinate, it is fit that the huſbands tell them; if you will not, another will; if the miſtreſs will not, the maid will come?"—Luther's ſermon, cited by Pluquet. What would Jerom have ſaid, if he had heard the whining cant, for declamation it cannot be called, of modern reformiſts againſt all *unprofitable auſterities*.

That a ſtate of continency in preference to the matrimonial ſtate is recommended, though not enjoined in the goſpel and the apoſtolical writings, is denied by none, if not by thoſe, whoſe ignorance is not only contemptible, but degrading: learned proteſtants admit it, Grotius, in his commentary on the 1ſt epiſtle to the Corinthans, vii; Forbes, in his firſt book of moral Theology; and Dodwell, in his ſecond diſſertation on the chronology of popes, amongſt Pearſon's poſthumous works, acknowledges, that, in conſequence of St. Paul's advice, virginity was eſteemed, and many virgins inſtituted in the time of pope Clement, of whom St. Paul ſpeaks in one of his epiſtles. We know from better authority than Dodwell that perpetual continency was in high repute; and ſtrictly obſerved by many in the apoſtle's days, and ever ſince down to this preſent day: it has been already ſhewn that Philip the evangeliſt's four daughters lived in a ſtate of perpetual continency: this is atteſted by St. Luke, Acts xxi, 8, and by Polycrates, biſhop of Epheſus, who calls Philip an apoſtle; he was one of the ſeven deacons. Juſtin, the philoſopher, who ſuffered martyrdom about the year 167, in his apology addreſſed to the emperors Titus Elius, Antoninus, and Lucius, the philoſopher, to the Senate and Romans, in order to diſabuſe the Heathens, and vindicate the morality of Chriſtians from miſrepreſentation, after citing theſe paſſages from the goſpel which recommend chaſtity, and condemn even impure thoughts, ſays: "there are many men and women, who preſerve their virginal purity to the age of ſixty or ſeventy, having followed the doctrine of Chriſt from their infancy."

Athenagoras, a Chriſtian philoſopher, alſo, in his apology offered to the emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius

us Verus, in juſtification of Chriſtian morality, ſays: "you will find amongſt us many perſons of both ſexes who grow old in a ſtate of perpetual continency, hoping in that ſtate to be more perfectly united to God."

Origenes, in cap. 15, ad. Rom. "what we do beyond what is due, we do not do from precepts, for inſtance virginity is not paid from a debt, for it is not exacted by a precept, but it is offered beyond all debt;" and in his 23d homily on the book of Numbers he ſays: it is certain that the perpetual ſacrifice is impeded by thoſe who are ſubſervient to conjugal neceſſities, whence it appears to me that, to offer the ſacrifice is his duty excluſively, who devotes himſelf to unceaſing and perpetual chaſtity." Euſebius of Cæſarea thought ſo too, in his firſt book of evangelical demonſtration, ch. 8, he ſays: "it becometh thoſe, who are conſecrated, and occupied in the miniſtry, and in the divine worſhip, to contain themſelves from any commerce with their wives." The Germanic apoſtle, that venerable patriarch of reforming memory, had not yet thundered out this new-modelled doctrine: "*if the wife will not, the maid will come.*"

St. Jerom, in defence of his books againſt Jovinian, in which ſome expreſſions were thought to reflect on the matrimonial ſtate, writes thus to Pammachuis: "read, I pray you, and diligently conſider the words of the apoſtle (1. Cor. vii.) and you will ſee that to avoid calumny, I have been much more indulgent to married perſons than the apoſtle deſired. Origines, Dennis, Pierius, Euſebius, of Cæſarea, Didymus and Apollinaris have moſt copiouſly *(latiſſime)* explained this epiſtle, of whom *Pierius*, diſcuſſing the ſenſe of the apoſtle, and propoſing to elucidate this paſſage: '*I would have all men as I am,*' adds: '*tauta legŏn ŏ Paulos antikrus agamiam keruſſei*' Paul ſaying this, publicly preaches *perpetual continency* "*agamiam.*" "What then," continues Jerom, pray is my fault? What ſeverity? All that I have written compared to this one ſentence are inſignificant, *leviſſima.*"

In his catalogue of eccleſiaſtical writers, St. Jerom ſays of

of Pierius, that from his great eloquence and perfect knowledge of dialectics and rhetoric, he was called the younger Origenes. But Jerom was a monk. True: and Pierius, of whom he writes, was fond of an aſcetic life, " *miræ aſkeſios appetitorem.*" They were monks of the old ſchool, not hogs from the ſty of Epicurus. The works of Jerom, yet extant, ſhew him to have been the moſt intelligent, and beſt informed man of his age; the writer adds, without fearing a contradiction, that his equal has not, ſince his time, been ſeen. The works of Pierius are unfortunately loſt. They were extant in the fourth century when Jerom wrote; but the works of a man of greater authority, whom Jerom cites as his maſter, and to whom he ſays no Latin writer was equal, that is, Gregory of Nizianzen, are yet extant: he wrote a poem in hexamater verſe, in which the virginal and matrimonial ſtates are introduced diſputing thus concluding: " *Suzugion potheontes omōs ge ſtephouſi karēnon partheniēs Chriſtos de didous gras amphoterōiſi tēn men dexiterē pareſtēſetai egguthi cheiri tēn d'eteren laē kudos dete kai to megiſton.* Even they who deſire marriage crown the head of virginity: Chriſt, who gives a reward to both, will make the one (virginity) ſtand to the right near his hand, and the other (the matrimonial ſtate) to the left, and that alſo is a very great honour,"

Let the reader diſpaſſionately compare the doctrine of theſe ancients, confeſſedly the moſt correct, the moſt intelligent, the moſt accurate, and the moſt eloquent of eccleſiaſtical writers, whether Greek or Latin, with the canting dialect of modern reformiſts, and then judge, if it be true, as they pretend, that they have reaſſumed the form of the primitive church. Let him ſeriouſly reflect on a fact, which the world knows, that is, that Luther, Oecolampadius, with all their aſſociates, were monks or prieſts of the church of Rome, baptiſed in that church, had made their ſolemn vows, and promiſes of perpetual continency according to the diſcipline of that church, which commenced with it, and continued without variation

tion until the time of their apoſtacy; that theſe men, in the face of the world, broke their vows and promiſes, regardleſs of a diſcipline authoriſed by the apoſtles, ſo venerable for its antiquity, and if he can then prevail on himſelf to believe, that the God of Truth and Sanctity, ſent ſuch unſanctified miſcreants to reform his church, the writer is at a loſs to conjecture, whom he would call emiſſaries of the Demon.

The facts ſtated are incontrovertible, the only queſtion that can come under diſcuſſion is, whether theſe monks were obliged to perform their vows, or not; this queſtion might, with ſome propriety, be diſcuſſed in the School of Epicurus: he is not a chriſtian who doubts it; it is an axiom in morality, that a man, who, free from conſtraint, promiſes what is good in itſelf, lawful and poſſible, is obliged to perform his promiſe; that continency is good, lawful, poſſible, and even laudable, is true, or St. Paul was a falſe teacher: in his firſt epiſtle to Corinthians, vii, 1, the apoſtle ſays: "*it is good for a man not to approach a wife.* "*Kalon anthropō gunaikos mē apteſthai,*" and he adds, v. 27: *art thou not bound to a wife? lelusa apo gunaikos; do not ſeek a wife*" *mē zētei gunaika.* If the apoſtle called that which is *bad, unlawful* or *impoſſible*, *good*; or if he exhorted Chriſtians to practiſe that which is *bad, unlawful* or *impoſſible*, he was a falſe teacher; *continency*, therefore, which he called *good*, to which he exhorted the faithful, is neither bad in itſelf, unlawful nor impoſſible; hence it manifeſtly follows, that theſe reforming monks, and prieſts, and all theſe nuns, whom they ſeduced from their convents, were perjured apoſtates: this is not an abſtruſe queſtion; the man muſt be unaccountably ſtupid, who does not conceive it.

In this epiſtle we find the apoſtle's ſolution of ſome difficulties propoſed to him by the Chriſtians of Corinth: "of theſe things, concerning which you wrote to me: it is good for a man not to approach a wife (or woman) *gunaikos*; but on account of fornication, let each man have his own wife, and each woman her own huſband,"

vii,

vii, 1–2. It is hardly poſſible to recommend continency with greater force; Pierius was juſtified when he ſaid that Paul publicly preached perpetual continency: for the apoſtle recommends continency even in the married ſtate, it is true, he requires the mutual conſent of both parties, for without it that virtue is not regularly practicable in the married ſtate. "It is good," ſays he, "for a man not to approach a wife." As there is nothing oppoſite to good but evil, and the conjugal rights exempt from evil, the apoſtle may be underſtood by the term *kalon good*, to expreſs the idea of *uſeful* or *expedient*, this is the greateſt latitude that can be admitted; hence we muſt conclude that though conjugal acceſs be allowed to prevent a very great evil, that is, fornication, it is not expedient for the ſalvation of the parties; could the apoſtle more expreſsly recommend continency? The apprehenſion of evil does not render that which is good or expedient, in itſelf, bad or inexpedient; but it authoriſes that, which is inexpedient, to prevent what is criminal; however great the impediments in the true path, it is better to perſevere in it, than deviate from it; but if the apprehenſion of evil be removed, a wiſe man in his choice of means will give the preference to that which is good, and expedient: the ſtep is more ſteady even in the true path when all impediments are removed. The apoſtle continues: "Let the huſband render unto the wife due benevolence, and in like manner the wife to the huſband." Benevolence is of indiſpenſable neceſſity, whether they live in a ſtate of continency or not, hence the apoſtle ſtrictly enjoins it, and immediately adds: "the wife has not the power of her own body, but the huſband, in like manner the huſband has not the power of his own body, but the wife." This truth preſuppoſed, he ſays: "do not you defraud one the other, if it be not by mutual conſent for a time for the exerciſe of faſting and prayer." This obſervation juſtifies the truth of his firſt aſſertion, that it is not expedient for a man to approach a wife; and gives weight to the advice, which he gives to the unmarried

unmarried, to perſevere in that ſtate: for what can be more inexpedient than to depend on the will of another perſon for the exerciſe of faſting and prayer, which, however deſpiſed and neglected by the diſciples of Epicurus, was thought expedient and uſeful by Paul, his fellow apoſtles, and their diſciples? Yet, however inexpedient conjugal acceſs, it is lawful, and may prevent a great evil, hence the apoſtle permits them to reſume the exerciſe of their marriage rights after they have ſpent ſome time in faſting and prayer, "leſt," ſays he, "Satan tempt you on account of your incontinency." To convince them that their return to theſe rights, from which they had abſtained by mutual conſent, was not a duty, the apoſtle declares it to be ſimply a permiſſion and indulgence: "this I ſay according to permiſſion, not according to precept: "*touto de lego kata Sugnomen ou kat' epitagēn.*" The apoſtle exhorts to what is good and expedient, and he permits what is inexpedient but to prevent a great evil: in the enſuing words the apoſtle explains his thoughts without reſerve: "I would have all men to be as I am myſelf." The apoſtle was not dependant on the will of another: he was ſole maſter of his will, as he was of his body, which he chaſtiſed with ſtripes and reduced to ſervitude, leſt whilſt he preached to others he ſhould himſelf be reprobated. *Alla ūpōpiazō to ſōma mou kai doulagagō mēpōs allois keruxas autos adokimos genetai.* The apoſtle, if we believe himſelf, thought theſe auſterities, which chaſtiſe the body and keep it in a ſtate of ſubjection, indiſpenſably neceſſary to avoid perdition; our modern reformiſts think *them unprofitable.* Southwell, who could not think of informing his readers that the apoſtle uſed ſtripes to puniſh himſelf, it has ſuch an appearance of popiſh ſuperſtition, tranſlates *upopiazō, I keep under.* Let his reader conſult Schrevelius' lexicon, he will find "*up-piazō,*" *plagis contundo, domo, validis ictibus ſubjicio reluctantem.* The reader will pardon this ſhort digreſſion, as St. Paul was well aware that it is better to continue in the true path, though rendered difficult by number-

leſs

leſs impediments than to ſtray from it entirely, he permits married perſons to enjoy the privileges of their ſtate, warns them of their danger, and intimates his wiſh, that, to remove all impediments, they would by mutual conſent live in a ſtate of continency, "*that they, who have wives, may be as not having them.*"

After giving his inſtructions to perſons engaged in the married ſtate, the apoſtle inſtructs thoſe who are free from ſuch an engagement: "but I ſay to the unmarried and to widows: it is good for them if they perſevere as I do; but if they do not contain themſelves let them marry; for it is better to marry than burn." As in his inſtruction to married perſons he permits the uſe of marriage not as good or expedient, but through the apprehenſion of danger, as a part of the cargo is ſometimes thrown into the ſea to ſave the veſſel from ſinking, ſo, in his inſtruction to the unmarried, he permits the contract for the ſame reaſon, "if they do not contain themſelves let them marry; for it is better to marry than burn" (be burned). Southwell's verſion of this paſſage, beſides being horribly impious, inſults mankind: he makes the apoſtle ſay: "*if they cannot contain themſelves.*" What! Is it that there are Chriſtians who cannot contain themſelves? A young woman who cannot be married in early life, or according to her rank in ſociety, muſt ſhe proſtitute herſelf? There is no mean: ſhe muſt contain herſelf, or proſtitute herſelf. A wife in the abſence of her huſband, or a huſband in the abſence of his wife, muſt they break their promiſe of fidelity? What impudence to aſſert it? If the apoſtle had ſaid it, his epiſtle would never have found a place amongſt canonical writings. Southwell calumniates the apoſtle: he gives his deluded readers the ſuggeſtions of the Demon of uncleanneſs for the doctrine of the God of Truth and Sanctity. Theſe are the ſcriptures to which our modern Reformiſts invite their readers! In theſe they muſt find the faith without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God! The words of the apoſtle are ſo clearly intelligible that

they cannot be misunderstood, this impious version is, therefore, an intended falsehood : *ei de ouk egkrateuontai gamesatosan*, " if they do not contain themselves, let them marry." The apostle permits marriage to prevent crimes ; he does not prescribe it as a preservative against temptations : for a temptation however great does not burn, it is the consent of the will, which constitutes the crime, it is the crime which burns, not the temptation, which may be repelled. The alternatives shew how strongly prepossessed the apostle was against the matrimonial state, considered as an impediment in the way of salvation, though he admitted it to be lawful and honorable. After giving some instructions to Christians, who were engaged in marriage to Heathens before their conversion to the faith, St. Paul resumes the comparison between the married and the unmarried states, and most persuasively recommends the latter : " concerning virgins," says he, " a commandment of the Lord I have not ; but a counsel I give as having received mercy from the Lord to be faithful, I think therefore this to be good on account of instant necessity ; because it is good for a man to be so. *Art thou bound to a wife? Seek not to be loosed. Art thou not bound to a wife? Do not seek a wife.*" What could the apostle say more? Could he direct married men to dismiss their wives? It would have been impious. Could he order unmarried men to desist from engaging in the matrimonial state: no, he had no such precept from the Lord. It is a maxim that what is not forbidden is lawful, however inconvenient or inexpedient it may be, the apostle therefore permits what is lawful though inexpedient, and advises that which is also lawful, and expedient : " if," continues he, " thou marry, thou hast not sinned ; and if a virgin marry she hath not sinned ; but such will have tribulation in the flesh ; and I spare you " The apostle had already urged one motive to engage the unmarried to persevere in a state of continency : because it is expedient for salvation to be absolutely independent on the

the will of another. To this motive, which is a ſtrong inducement to embrace a ſtate of continency, he adds another, which deters a judicious man from the matrimonial ſtate—the married will have tribulation in the fleſh; and I ſpare you. There are croſſes in the married ſtate, and mortifications unavoidable, which the apoſtle expreſſes with great energy, calling them "*tribulation in the fleſh*", *thlipſin de tĕ ſarki*. Of theſe he warned his diſciples, expreſſing his wiſh that they ſhould avoid them, "*I ſpare you.*" In his reply to the firſt queſtion he adviſed continency by mutual conſent, becauſe it is expedient for ſalvation. After giving directions to the unmarried, he preſſes the ſame advice on this general motive: "becauſe the time is contracted," '*óti ò kairos ſunestalmenos*,' it therefore remains that they who have wives be as not having them." .... "The figure of this world paſſes, I would have you free from ſolicitude, the unmarried man is ſolicitous about the things of the Lord, how to pleaſe the Lord; but the married man is ſolicitous about the things of the world, how to pleaſe the wife."

The apoſtle did not think the benediction conferred on our firſt parents to people the world, (a benediction not confined to mankind excluſively; for it was given in the ſame terms to the beaſts of the field) a precept which obliged their deſcendants now that the world is full of people; he thought it full time to think of peopling that world, for which we were originally intended, hence with all his powers of perſuaſion he adviſed his diſciples to begin here on earth that ſtate of perfect continency which will continue for ever hereafter: "when they ſhall riſe from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels who are in Heaven," —Mark xii, 25. If the ſtate of the Elect after the Reſurrection be a ſtate of perfection, which no Chriſtian will preſume to deny, perpetual continency is therefore a perfection. Hence follow two conſequences, the firſt that the apoſtle was juſtified in recommending it, the

ſecond

ſecond that he who condemns it is not a Chriſtian. What will be the fate of theſe ſacrilegious monks who renounced it? Or what the fate of their ſucceſſors, who ſo ſtrenuouſly endeavour to continue the deluſion?

There are eccleſiaſtics in the Greek church in communion with the See of Rome, engaged in the matrimonial ſtate. Yes, but they are engaged before their admiſſion to orders, and are never allowed to contract a ſecond engagement, nor are they permitted to aſcend to the epiſcopal order in the enjoyment of that privilege, which the perſevering importunity of the Greeks, after repeated refuſals, at length extorted on ſome unlucky day. In the year 691, about eleven years after the ſixth General Council, ſome prelates aſſembled at Conſtantinople, in the hall of the palace called Trullus, and, aſſuming the name of a Council, though not called by proper authority, nor acknowledged, they pretended to make canons of diſcipline, which the fifth and ſixth General Councils had not done, hence that Aſſembly was called by the Greeks *Penthekté*, and by the Latins *Quiniſextum*. In their third canon they ſay: "the Romans are attached to the exactneſs of rule; they who depend on the See of Conſtantinople have more condeſcenſion, we combine both in order to avoid exceſs, wherefore they who have been twice married before the 15th of January of the laſt fourth indiction of the year *6199, ſhall be depoſed; they whoſe marriages have been diſſolved before that day, ſhall be continued in their rank, but interdicted from all functions; in future we renew the canon, which prohibits the ordination of biſhop, prieſt or deacon, or of any perſon in whatever rank in the Clergy, who ſhall have been twice married, or who ſhall have had a concubine after baptiſm, or who ſhall have married a widow, or a divorced woman, or a courtezan, a ſlave, or a comedian." This is a renewal of the 16th and 17th of the apoſtolical canons which are thus expreſſed, 16th: he, who

* The fourth indiction of the year 6199 of the world, correſponds with the year 691.

who after baptiſm has been engaged in two marrriages, or has had a concubine, cannot be a biſhop, prieſt or deacon, or finally of the ſacerdotal catalogue, " *ex Conſortio ſacerdotali,*"—17th : he, who has married a widow, or a woman ſeparated from her huſband by a divorce, or a proſtitute, or a ſlave, or any of theſe women engaged in the public ſhews, cannot be a biſhop, prieſt, or deacon, or of the ſacerdotal community."

The Aſſembly continues : " as it is found in the canons, that readers and choiriſters only are allowed to marry after their firſt admiſſion, we forbid all ſub-deacons, deacons, and prieſts to marry under the penalty of depoſition ; if therefore any of them deſire to marry let them do it before they enter into any of theſe orders." The canon to which they allude is the 26th of the apoſtolical canons : it is thus conceived : " of theſe who unmarried are entered amongſt the clergy, ' *qui Cœlibes in Cleram pervenerunt,*' we order that readers only and choiriſters may marry if they will."

The aſſembly of Trullus ſay in their 11th can. becauſe we know that in the church of the Romans it is tradition in the order of the canon : " *epeide en tē Romaiōn ekklēſia en taxei Kanonis paradedoſthai diegnōmen,*" that they, who are to be ordained biſhops, prieſts or deacons, muſt confeſs that they will not cohabit with their wives ; but we, following the perfection of the ancient apoſtolical canon, deſire that the marriages of theſe, who are in holy orders, ſubſiſt without depriving them of the company of their wives but in the proper times ; ſo that if any one be thought worthy to be ordained ſub-deacon, deacon or prieſt, he ſhall not be excluded on account of being engaged in lawful marriage, and at the time of his ordination he ſhall not be required to abſtain from the company of his wife, not to diſhonour marriage, which God has inſtituted and bleſſed with his company ; we know alſo that the Fathers of the Council of Carthage have ordered, that ſub-deacons, deacons and prieſts, ſhould abſtain from their wives, according *to proper terms*, that

that following the apoſtolical tradition we may obſerve the time of every thing, principally of faſting and prayer: for it is neceſſary that they, who approach the altar, ſhould be perfectly continent at the time when they touch holy things, that their prayers may be heard." The canons which they cite, is the fifth of the apoſtolical and the 3d canon of the Council of Carthage, already cited, both miſunderſtood or miſtated, and manifeſtly diſtorted from the intended ſenſe: the apoſtolical canon ſays: "let not the biſhop, prieſt or deacon, reject his wife under the pretext of religion; if he rejects her, let him be ſecluded from the communion, and if he perſeveres let him be depoſed." The canon was underſtood at all times. and by all churches, before this aſſembly awkwardly attempted to diſtort it, to prohibit biſhops, prieſts and deacons, aſſumed to the miniſtry on their promiſe of continency, from diſmiſſing their wives from their care; they were ſtrictly obliged to provide them with all the neceſſaries of life.

The canon of the Council of Carthage is miſtated perhaps through the ignorance of their interpreter: it is thus conceived: "it is decreed that biſhops, prieſts and deacons according to former ſtatutes, '*ſecundum priora ſtatuta*,' abſtain from wives; if not, let them be removed from the eccleſiaſtical office." The interpreter to the aſſembly, whether through ignorance or malice is doubtful, tranſlates the Latin terms *priora ſtatuta* former ſtatutes by the Greek terms *idious ōrous* which ſignify *proper terms*, and the aſſembly concludes that the obligation of continency was confined to certain times, that is, as they explain it, to the times of their miniſtry in the church, which is not continual in the Greek church as it is in the Latin church.

In all attempts at innovation, inconſiſtencies are unavoidable: the Aſſembly of Trullus gives a ſtriking inſtance of this truth: the canons, which they cite, ſpeak in the ſame manner of the biſhop, prieſt and deacon; and in that ſenſe they were always underſtood. Leo I. in his epiſtle

epiſtle to Ruſticus, biſhop of Norbornne, written in the year 443, that is 248 years before this Synod of Trullus was aſſembled, ſays: "the law of continency is the ſame for the miniſters of the altar, as it is for the biſhops and prieſts, who whilſt laymen or readers might lawfully marry, but when they entered into theſe orders, what before was lawful, began to be unlawful, wherefore that a carnal marriage may be converted into a ſpiritual marriage, they muſt not diſmiſs their wives, but have them as if they had them not, ſo that charity may continue, and the uſe of marriage rights may ceaſe." —Epi. 99, cap. 3. The Aſſembly of Trullus acknowledges that theſe canons forbid the biſhop to cohabit with his wife. Why not the prieſt and deacon? The canons make no diſtinction: they ſay, can. 11th, "Having learned that in Africa and other places there are biſhops, who make no difficulty of cohabiting with their wives after their ordination, *to the great ſcandal of the people*, (by the bye they did not think that a biſhop muſt be a wived man) we forbid them to do ſo in future, under penalty of depoſition;" and in the 48th can. they ſay: "that the wife of him, who is to be admitted into the epiſcopal order, being ſeparated from him by mutual conſent, after his ordination ſhall enter into a monaſtery diſtant from the place of the biſhop's reſidence, who ſhall, notwithſtanding, provide for her ſubſiſtence:" a proviſion for her ſubſiſtence was at all times indiſpenſable, when the huſband was aſſumed to the miniſtry with the wife's conſent, without her conſent he could not be admitted. Humbert, in his reply to Nicetas, a petulant Greek, ſays: "we confeſs that it is not lawful for a biſhop, prieſt, or deacon, on pretext of religion, to diſmiſs his wife from his care, that is, that he muſt ſupply her with food and raiment, but he muſt not cohabit with her in the uſual manner. Thus we read the apoſtles to have done. The apoſtle Paul ſays, 1ſt Cor. ix, have we not the power of conducting about a ſiſter woman *adelphēn gunaika* as the other apoſtles and the brothers of the Lord

Lord, and Cephas, ſee, you fool, continues Humbert, the apoſtle does not ſay: "have we not the power of *cohabiting* with a ſiſter woman, but of conducting her about that ſhe might be ſupported at their expence, not that the uſe of marriage might ſubſiſt between them." Our reformiſts tranſlate the terms—*adelphēn gunaika*—a ſiſter, a wife, to induce a belief that the apoſtle was married, though he himſelf atteſts the contrary; ſo untenable is error, that every attempt to ſupport it is fruitleſs: the verſion, ſuppoſed true, condemns them: for the terms *ſiſter* and *wife* cannot be underſtood of the ſame woman in any other ſenſe but this, that ſhe who is a wife is become as a ſiſter. That, however, is not the genuine ſenſe: the term *adelphēn*, *ſiſter*, is aſſumed as an adjective, and ſignifies a *chriſtian*, *adelphēn gunaika*, *a chriſtian woman.*

The reader, accuſtomed to the railing of every ſcribbler againſt that popiſh ſuperſtition *continency*, will be ſurpriſed to find that this virtue of late invention, the propagation of the human ſpecies, ſo indiſpenſably neceſſary, and ſo piouſly obſerved by all the miniſters of the new ſchool was not known to the primitive church; that the Aſſembly of Trullus, in all their reſearches, could find nothing in antiquity to countenance their innovation but theſe two canons which they could not fit to their purpoſe; nor was the innovation ſo very great in appearance: it only extended to permit prieſts, deacons, and ſub-deacons, to cohabit with the wives, which they had married before their ordination, and obliged them to abſtain during the terms of their miniſtering. However, from them we learn that continency in the Clergy was the invariable rule of the Roman church; "we have known," ſay they, "that it is delivered in the order of the canon *en taxei kanonis*, that they who are to be ordained deacons or prieſts muſt profeſs that they will not cohabit with their wives; this, therefore, was the invariable rule until the year 691, when the Synod of Trullus was aſſembled, ſince that time the fact is indiſputable: this innovation in univerſal diſcipline made

by

by the Synod of Trullus, was ſeverely cenſured by the Latin church. Humbert, legate to Leo IX. in his refutation of Nicetas' libel againſt the Latins, ſays: "I am not ſurpriſed that you impute to Pope Agatho, and the venerable Fathers of the ſixth Synod, your own ravings, and the canons, which you have corrupted or forged, ſince you impute fictions to our Lord Jeſus himſelf and to his apoſtles. Knowing that the ſixth Synod was aſſembled to ſuppreſs the hereſy of Greek monothelites, not to give new conſtitutions to the Romans, we entirely refute theſe chapters, which you obtrude under its authority, becauſe the firſt and the Apoſtolical See has not at any time received them, nor hitherto obſerved them."

Anaſtaſius, the librarian, in his preface to the ſeventh Synod, ſays: "of the regulations, which the Greeks pretend to have been made in the ſixth Synod, theſe only are received in this, which are found not to be contrary to former canons, or decrees of the venerable pontiffs of this Holy See, or to good morals. Though hitherto they have remained totally unknown to the Latins, becauſe they have not been tranſlated, nor are they found in the archives of the other patriarchal Sees, though they uſe the Greek language; becauſe when they were paſſed none of theſe was found promulgating, conſenting or even preſent, though the Greeks ſay that the ſame Fathers who compoſed the ſixth Synod publiſhed them, but this they cannot prove by any authentic document."

Independently on this teſtimony of Anaſtatius, who firſt tranſlated the acts of that Aſſembly, we have their own acknowledgement: they ſay in their addreſs to Juſtinian Rhinotmetus, then emperor: "whereas the moſt holy and univerſal Synods, the fifth under Juſtinian Auguſtus, and the ſixth under Conſtantine Auguſtus, your Father, after declaring the myſtery of faith from the Fathers, *Patrokas*, did not make canons as the other four univerſal Synods did."

The pretence of the Greeks that the ſame prelates

who compoſed the ſixth Synod were preſent at the Aſſembly of Trullus, is totally unfounded: Tharaſſius of Conſtantinople, and Peter of Nicomedia, in the fourth action of the ſeventh Synod, admitted, that four or five years intervened between the diſſolution of the ſixth Synod and the commencement of the Aſſembly of Trullus. Fleury ſays eleven years intervened, Anaſtatius better informed than Fleury, ſays that twenty ſeven years had paſt, and his teſtimony is ſupported by Theophanes, who was preſent at the ſeventh Synod, in the year 787.

Whatever modern Greeks may think of the authority of that Aſſembly over the diſtrict immediately ſubject to the patriarchal See of Conſtantinople, its diſpoſitions could have no force in the other patriarchates. From the innovation then introduced by the authority of that Synod we conclude, with unerring certainty, that it was invariably the rule, with Greeks as well as Latins, that a profeſſion of continency was exacted from all theſe, who, in a married ſtate, were admitted to holy orders. Of the Latins there can be no doubt: the Aſſembly acknowledges it. Of the Greeks it is equally certain: for if the privilege of cohabiting with their wives had been enjoyed by their prieſts and deacons before, they would not then have granted it.

The writer has been induced to diſcuſs this article accurately, in order to undeceive, not this Edinburgh caſtigator, for men who endeavour to embarraſs truth in order to deceive are not to be undeceived, but ſome Catholics who ſeem to think the promiſe of continency, which the church exacts of her miniſters, a ſevere reſtraint, and expreſs an opinion that to effect a reconciliation it might, perhaps ought, to be removed in favour of certain nations. The writer has no opinion on the ſubject: he confines himſelf to ſhew that, this diſcipline, however ſevere it may appear, is of primeval inſtitution, authoriſed by the example, and, he believes with Bellarmine, by the precept of the apoſtles, ſtrictly obſerved by all theſe lights of the church, whom we call Fathers.

Our

Our caſtigator, whoſe ſagacity is not confined to theſe beings, on which his turbid imagination beſtows an exiſtence, diſcovers that papiſts are the only people, who claim infallibility as diſtinctive of the true church: "if infallibility be the diſtinguiſhing characteriſtic of the true church, how then," ſays he, p. 193, "was it never claimed by any but papiſts ſince the apoſtles' days, though heretics in all ages have declared themſelves to be the true church of Chriſt?" It is therefore the characteriſtic of an heretical conventicle to declare itſelf the true church of Chriſt without claiming the prorogative of infallibility. So ſays the caſtigator. Does the man underſtand himſelf? He admits that papiſts, ſince the apoſtles' days, did claim infallibility of deciſion as diſtinctive of the true church, and that this claim was not made by any hereticle conventicle; papiſts, therefore, are not to be numbered amongſt ſects: they make the claim, which no ſect has made, and they have continued to make this claim ſince the apoſtles' days; it is therefore of apoſtolical original. Thus he inadvertently and injudiciouſly informs his readers, that this doctrine of infallibility has been invariably taught in the true church of Jeſus Chriſt, and denied by all ſectaries; to gratify his curioſity, the writer aſſigns a very ſimple reaſon why infallibility of doctrine is claimed by papiſts, as he calls us catholics, and diſclaimed by all ſectaries. We believe the truth of Chriſt's words; and we know that he promiſed to be with theſe paſtors and teachers, whom he gives to his church for the perfection of the ſaints, for the work of the miniſtry, until the conſummation; and we know alſo that it is not by falſe doctrine that the ſaints are perfected: "they, who worſhip God muſt worſhip him in *ſpirit and truth*,"—John iv, 24. Sectaries make no ſuch claim, for reaſons equally ſimple: the firſt, becauſe Chriſt has promiſed them nothing, if not puniſhment for diſobedience; and the ſecond, which bears no reply: becauſe the leaders of all ſects muſt pretend to correct errors; they muſt therefore in ſelf-

defence

defence deny the infallibility of Chriſt's church ; if they acknowledged it infallible there could be no errors to correct ; and to claim for a ſect or conventicle of their own invention, a prerogative, which they are forced to refuſe to the church of Chriſt's inſtitution would expoſe them to the contempt of their followers. From this principle, which all ſectaries muſt adopt, two truths are manifeſtly deduced, which render hereſy inexcuſable, the firſt that ſince the teachers of any ſect whatever are ſo far from pretending to infallible doctrine, that they profeſſedly diſclaim it, the doctrine, which they teach is meer conjecture ; which may or may not be true, as is the nature of all conjectures, this truth is not to be eluded ; and the ſecond is irreſiſtible, that it is not the doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt : for his doctrine is infallibly true, in it there is no conjecture.

Our caſtigator, who knows no other principle of proof but unbluſhing confidence in aſſertion, reſting on the authority of his ſpirit of divination, "*thus faith ob.*" or of ſome garbled extract, fitted to his purpoſe, tells us, that the practiſe of papiſts is contrary to the laws of nature and of Chriſt, p. 193. Papiſts reply that calumny is contrary to the firſt law of nature, which heathens expreſſed in theſe few words : "do not to another what you would not wiſh him to do to you ;" they add that the father of lies is emphatically called a *Calumniator.* Is the epithet applicable to his *ob* ? In the ſame page he ſays that the Church of Rome rejected parts of the canon of ſcripture which the Council of Trent recogniſed, and adds that the Council of Trent admitted into the canon books which were declared to be no part of the word of God. Theſe aſſertions are ſimply falſe, his *ob.* has deceived him. When he ſhall think it convenient to ſpecify theſe books rejected by the church of Rome, and recogniſed by the Council of Trent, and aſſign ſome reaſons beſides the authority of his *ob.* the writer will diſcuſs them. The apoſtle Paul he ſays, prohibited the uſe of an unknown tongue in the church, unleſs accompa-

nied

nied by an interpreter. He calumniates the apoſtle as he does the papiſts: St. Paul directs the man, who ſpeaks in the church for the inſtruction or edification of others, to ſpeak the language which they underſtand, or employ an interpreter; if there be no interpreter he very judiciouſly orders the man to be ſilent as to the people, to ſpeak to himſelf and to God *êautō laleitō kai tō theō*, 1ſt Cor. xiv, 28—he does not prohibit the uſe of an unknown tongue; but he confines it to its proper uſe. His ſpirit of divination diſcovers an inconſiſtency between this pretended prohibition and a declaration of the Council of Trent: "the Council," ſays he, "declared every perſon accurſed, who ſhould ſay that Maſs ought to be celebrated only in the vulgar tongue." He calumniates the Council, as he does the apoſtle: they only were anathematiſed who ſay that it is contrary to the inſtitution of Chriſt to celebrate the maſs in any other but the vulgar tongue—ſee can. 9, Seſſ. xxii. He ſeems to know as much of the maſs, or of the Council of Trent, as an indian does of the calculation of an eclipſe. Does he know that the public inſtruction at the celebration of maſs is according to St. Paul's injunction, in the language underſtood by the people? That all the prayers of the Liturgy are addreſſed to God, who underſtands all languages? That even theſe are tranſlated in catholic prayer books, ſo that inſtead of one there are many interpreters in the Church at the ſame time? To paſs unnoticed the abſurdity of calling the Latin tongue, an unknown languague; is that an unknown language, of which a gentleman in any country would bluſh to acknowledge his ignorance? It is the language of all men of ſcience, of all nations, though this caſtigator and his *ob.* may not underſtand it.

"The ſixth General Council," he ſays, "declared that marriage is diſſolved by hereſy." The aſſertion is falſe, the Council made no ſuch declaration. The contrary was declared by the Council of Trent. True, and juſtly, though this caſtigator may not believe it; this Council

Council, continues the caſtigator, decreed that the myſtical benedictions, lights, incenſe, garments and other frippery, uſed in the Maſs were apoſtolical traditions. Why not cite the decree? General aſſertions without any reference indicate impoſture. There is no decree of the Council on the ſubject. In the fifth chapter of the 22d ſeſſion, which is not a decree but a ſimple expoſition of facts, the prelates ſay: "ſuch is the nature of man that without external aids it cannot eaſily be elevated to the contemplation of divine things, hence our pious mother, the church, has inſtituted ſome rites, as that ſome things in the Maſs be pronounced with a low voice, and other things with a more elevated voice. She has alſo employed ceremonies, as myſtical benedictions, lights, incenſe, veſtments, and many other things of that kind, from apoſtolical diſcipline and tradition, whereby the majeſty of ſo great a ſacrifice is commended, and the minds of the faithful by theſe viſible ſigns of religion may be excited to the contemplation of the moſt high things, which are latent in this ſacrifice." The prelates ſay that in the Maſs the church employs many things from apoſtolical tradition, but does not ſpecify what theſe things are, and, in their decree, they ſay: "if any man ſhall ſay that the ceremonies, veſtments, and external ſigns which the Catholic church uſes in the celebration of Maſſes, are rather incentives of impiety, than offices of piety, let him be anathematiſed,"—can. 7, ſeſs. 22.

In oppoſition to the authority of the Council, the caſtigator cites a ſpeech from Antoninus of Valetilina, which fills a page, and, whilſt it ſwells his volume, expoſes both his ignorance and his folly: Antoninus ſays: "It is plain, from all hiſtory, that every church antiently had her particular rite of the maſs introduced by cuſtom; that, to gratify the Pope, the Roman Rite had been introduced into a number of Provinces, though the Rites of many Churches are ſtill very different from it; that the Roman Rite has alſo undergone great alterations, as is evident

dent from the book called *Ordo Romanus* . . . . That the veſtments, veſſels, and other ornaments of prieſts and altars, appear, from books, ſtatues and pictures, to have been ſo much altered, that were the ancients to return into the world, they would not know them" . . . . Suppoſing the whole of Antoninus' diſcourſe true, there is nothing in it inconſiſtent with the declaration of the Council: for the Council did not ſay that the Roman rite was the only rite in uſe in all churches, nor did it ſay that the Roman rite itſelf underwent no change, on the contrary it ordered that the ancient rite of every church ſhould be ſtrictly obſerved in that church: "*Retento ubique cujuſque Eccleſiæ antiquo ritu,*" —chap. 8. ſeſs 22, ſo that a Greek prieſt or an Armenian, though in communion with the See of Rome is not allowed to celebrate Maſs according to the Roman rite, nor in the Latin tongue. So much for the ignorance of this caſtigator; hear now his folly: he cites a teſtimony to ſhew that Maſs was celebrated in all churches in ancient times, but that each church had a rite peculiar to itſelf, and different from the Roman rite. It was not therefore from the Roman church that theſe churches borrowed this Maſs, which was celebrated in all churches with rites differing from the Roman rite, and in many in a language which the Romans did not underſtand. This univerſal agreement in eſſentials, and difference in accidental rites, ſhew, with irreſiſtible evidence, that this Maſs, which the caſtigator ſo piouſly hates, is of divine inſtitution in all its eſſential parts, and the accidental rites variable according to circumſtances. Another conſequence is deduced from this ſpeech of the caſtigator's friend Antoninus, who does not ſeem to have more reſpect for the pope than he ought to have: he ſays that: "to gratify the pope the Roman rite had been introduced into a number of provinces." The pontiff's influence therefore was great, and widely extended, ſince, to gratify his holineſs, a number of provinces ſubſtituted the Roman rite of celebrating the Maſs,

Maſs, to the rites of ancient uſe, in their own churches.

Something like the abortion of an argument had eſcaped the writer's notice, he reſumes it: "if," ſays the caſtigator, p. 192, "a Council regularly held be infallible, why do they pretend to found their deciſions upon the authority of the Fathers? None of theſe were infallibly directed in their judgment." A Council, regularly aſſembled, founds its deciſions in doctrines of faith on revelation, on the authority of which all doctrines of faith are believed, that ſuch or ſuch a doctrine has been revealed is a fact, which is known by teſtimony, as all facts are, not by metaphyſical diſquiſition, hence follows the indiſpenſable neceſſity of appealing to the teſtimony of the paſtors appointed by the apoſtles, and continued in their lawful ſucceſſors, not to ſhew that a doctrine revealed is true: for the truth of the doctrine reſts on the authority of God, but to ſhew that the doctrine was revealed: for this is a fact, the truth of which reſts on the teſtimony of theſe paſtors, who received theſe doctrines from the apoſtles, a teſtimony from which all ſects exclude themſelves. A Council cites the Fathers to ſhew, by their unanimous teſtimony, that ſuch was the doctrine tranſmitted to them by their predeceſſors in office, and whether any of the witneſſes be infallible or not, the united teſtimony of many intelligent witneſſes is infallibly true, though the caſtigator, or his *ob.* may not believe it. On the teſtimony of witneſſes, not more infallible than the caſtigator himſelf, a highwayman is ſent to Tyburn.

He aſks on what authority this writer explains the doctrines of religion, as he has no infallibility to direct his judgment or regulate his language,—p. 195: if this writer be a ſelf-conſtituted teacher, who ſubſtitutes the ravings of his own imagination, or the ſuggeſtions of his familiar ſpirit, to the ſettled doctrines of his church, the queſtion is propoſed with great propriety; but if he confines himſelf to teach ſettled doctrines, common

mon ſenſe is ſufficient to direct him ; if he deviates from the ſettled doctrines of his church, he has ſuperiors, who know how to correct his errors ; that ſlender portion of Chriſt's flock entruſted to his care is not expoſed to be the victims of his impoſture, his malignity, or his ignorance : this unhappy fate is reſerved for others, who having deſerted the fold, are diſmiſſed from the protecting cares of the Great Shepherd, and become the prey of ravening wolves and wily foxes.

Our caſtigator cloſes his fifth chapter with a paſſage of Iſaias, in which the deſtruction of Babylon is foretold, and his *ob* has informed him that the prophecy was not fulfilled by the deſtruction of Babylon, Rome alſo muſt be deſtroyed in the ſame manner, or Iſaias was a falſe prophet. As the writer has no confidence in the veracity of the caſtigator's *ob* and from the many ſpecimens which he has already ſeen, believes him to be, what the prophet Michahou calls, *rouach ſheker*, in plain Engliſh, a *lying ſpirit*, he will wait the event without anxiety.

The ſixth chapter begins with a preamble, in which nonſenſe is rendered doubly diſguſting by the air of gravity which it aſſumes : " the exiſtence of a church," ſays the caſtigator, p. 197, " pre-ſuppoſes the appointment of certain principles for regulating the faith and practice of its members. For this purpoſe he to whom the church belongs has given a revelation of his will in the ſcriptures." What a jumble of incoherencies ! *The appointment of certain principles for regulating the faith.* He has forgotten to inform us to whom he gave this revelation in the ſcriptures before the church exiſted. Fixed principles of faith, and ſound maxims of morality, muſt co-exiſt with the church and continue to exiſt in it whilſt the church exiſts, that is, until time ſhall be no more ; but that the exiſtence of the church pre-ſuppoſes theſe principles revealed in the ſcriptures before a line of the New Teſtament was written is rank nonſenſe. The apoſtles learned theſe principles of faith and maxims of morality from Chriſt himſelf, not from the ſcriptures, and

their disciples learned from them, not from the scriptures, hence St. Paul says "faith is from hearing,"—Rom. x, 17. In the same manner this Edinburgh castigator's disciples learn his opinions from himself. He tells them no doubt, that all his opinions are pure scripture, so did Arius, so did Eunomius, and that monster of impiety, Manicheas. Even the demon himself is said by the evangelist to have cited the scriptures, Matt. iv, 6.

If this castigator knows any thing of the formation of Christ's church, he must know that the church was founded, formed and instructed, before a line of the New Testament was written; that when written it was deposited in her hands, and entrusted to her care; that on her testimony we know that the books, which we now call scriptures, are of divine original. We Catholics do not consult the spirit of divination to learn facts which must be known by the testimony of witnesses.

After this preamble, in which the castigator has surpassed himself, he returns to that hackneyed tale which has been a thousand times repeated in the face not only of truth, and conviction, but even of common sense, that papists detract, to use his own words, from the value of the scriptures. This writer, in his Remarks on Doctor Stanser's Examination, p. 48, had said: "let us now revert to the rule of faith proposed by this Ex. 'Protestants,' says he, 'acknowledge no other rule of faith and doctrine than the holy scriptures.' The writer is willing to admit that Protestants acknowledge no other rule of faith; but the Rev. Ex. must also admit, that in theory, the scriptures cannot be a sole rule of faith; that in practice they are not, have not been, nor ever will be. This position, which lays the axe to the root, is nearly an intuitive truth. A sole rule of faith must extend to every truth, which is of faith: for any article of doctrine to which it does not extend recourse must be had to some other rule. The Rev. Ex. will have the modesty to admit there are some doctrinal truths, which are not

contained

contained in the ſcriptures: the firſt of theſe is, that the ſcriptures themſelves are divinely inſpired, and tranſmitted to us without interpolation or corruption. In no book of the ſcriptures do we find that theſe books, which we call canonical, were divinely inſpired, and if we did, the difficulty would be only transferred to itſelf: the queſtion would immediately recur—on what authority do we believe that this book, which makes the ſcriptures divinely inſpired, was itſelf divinely inſpired. This argument is, from the nature of things, inſoluble, and precludes even the poſſibility of evaſion: in vain this Rev. Ex. may refer to the private ſpirit, to a certain ſenſation, a certain taſte, a certain ſomething indeſcribable. All theſe certain things are moſt certainly no part of the ſcriptures; and, by having recourſe to them, he muſt admit that the ſcriptures are not his ſole rule of faith. To this the writer adds that, in practice, the ſcriptures are not the rule of proteſtant faith, the aſſertion he thinks incontrovertibly true, and is convinced that every unprejudiced proteſtant will admit it. Will it be denied that many proteſtants are incapable of reading the ſcriptures? Many incapable of inveſtigating the intended ſenſe of the ſacred writers? Many, who are proteſtants of one deſcription in preference to all others but becauſe their parents are of that particular denomination? And, to cloſe with a peremptory reaſon, which bears no reply, an immenſe majority, who are proteſtants before they read a line of the ſcriptures? Will any man preſume to aſſirm that men, who cannot read the ſcriptures, men, who do not read the ſcriptures, men, who, if they did read, cannot underſtand the ſcriptures, or, finally, men, who are already proteſtants before they read ſcriptures, take the ſcriptures for their ſole rule of faith? All reaſoning is loſt on the man, who would advance ſo great an abſurdity." The writer now ſubjoins the caſtigator's obſervation on this reaſoning: "every little art," he ſays, p. 198, "and the meaneſt ſophiſtry, has been employed,

to

to diminiſh the affection of men for the ſcriptures, and to excite their eſteem for what has been maintained to be the oral tradition of the church, to promote theſe laudable purpoſes the R. *(this writer)* has expatiated in a very lengthy manner, and entered keenly into the ſpirit of theſe quirks and quibbles, which have been often found to be the principal ſupport of popery. I cannot however join with him in theſe ſhouts of triumph, which on reviewing his labours, he raiſes over the proteſtant intereſts. A few obſervations will ſhew him that though his ſophiſtry may confuſe the minds of wavering papiſts, they will not affect proteſtants who have been taught to render a reaſon." What a nonſenſical jargon is here: he calls fair logical reaſoning *quirks and quibbles*. If there be a fallacy why not detect it? The writer thus publicly calls for a direct reply, or, an avowal that his reaſoning is not to be evaded. Let this caſtigator conſult, not his own ſpirit of divination, but ſome proteſtant univerſity, in which there are men of ſcience, verſed in dialectics, for if the reaſoning, which he advanced in his remarks, and here again repeats, be without a reply, the whole Reformation is defenceleſs, the attack is direct, it ſubverts the fundamental principle, the ſuperſtructure muſt fall of courſe. If proteſtants be taught to render a reaſon, as the caſtigator tells them, this writer calls again, not on the ignorant proteſtant, whoſe vanity is flattered, whilſt his ſimplicity is duped by impoſture, but on this caſtigator or ſome of his aſſociates, and he aſks: *Why the caſtigator believes the goſpel of St. John divinely inſpired?* Of this part of his faith the ignorant proteſtant can give no reaſon, and the writer aſſerts, without heſitation, that the moſt learned proteſtant is reduced to the ſame ſtraits.

To divert the attention of his readers from a train of reaſoning of ſuch immediate and irreſiſtible force that it extorts the aſſent of the underſtanding not blinded by prejudice, nor warped by intereſt; our caſtigator makes, what he calls obſervations to ſhew that proteſtants have

no

no reaſon to think the ſcriptures an inſufficient rule of faith; he begins by citing from this writers's remarks, the following paſſage, in which the advantages of the ſcriptures are clearly expoſed, as ſtated by St. Paul: "What advantage reſults from the poſſeſſion of the ſcriptures? The greateſt poſſible: it is aſſigned by St. Paul "*every writing divinely inſpired is uſeful to teach, to argue, to inſtruct, to correct in juſtice, that the man of God may be entire, perfectly prepared for every good work*," 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. Theſe were the ends, for which the ſcriptures were written, and given to the church already compoſed of paſtors teaching and adminiſtering ſacraments, and of ſimple faithful, who were taught by their paſtors." *Remarks*, *p.* 52. On this paſſage the caſtigator obſerves: "overlooking," ſays he, p. 199, "entirely his miſtranſlation of this apoſtle's language, I will merely contraſt his own views with the conduct of the Romiſh Church:" if there be a miſtranſlation, in which the ſenſe of the apoſtle is perverted why overlook it? Is it a miſtranſlation becauſe it does not coincide with the proteſtant verſion, in which the apoſtle is made to ſpeak nonſenſe, or aſſert a flagrant falſhood? The paſſage is thus tranſlated in the verſion now before the writer: "*all ſcripture is given by inſpiration of God*, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for inſtruction in righteouſneſs." Let the ſoleciſm "*all ſcripture*" paſs for the true ſenſe of the apoſtle, every writing "*paſa graphē*," but the addition "*is given by inſpiration of God*," for "*Theopneuſtos*" is intolerable: for we muſt underſtand the apoſtle to ſay that *every divine writing is divinely inſpired*, which is nonſenſe: whoever doubted it? Or that *every writing indiſcriminately is divinely inſpired, which* is a manifeſt falſehood: there are many writings in which there is nothing of divine inſpiration, and very little truth; and there are writings, by ſome called divine, in which the ſuggeſtions of the father of lies are artfully or ignorantly blended with the revelations of the ſpirit of truth, ſuch is that monſtrous compilation which is with great

great propriety called Southwell's bible. In the modern edition of the Greek teſtament, there is a *kai* ſubſtituted by ſome careleſs tranſcriber or printer, to an *eſti* which the Engliſh tranſlator might correct from the Latin verſion, without forcing the apoſtle to ſpeak nonſenſe.

To ſhew that the views of this writer are oppoſite to the conduct of the Romiſh church, this indefatigable tranſcriber fills a page with a rule of the Council of Trent, prohibiting the reading of the ſcriptures in the vulgar tongue, without the approbation of the biſhop, and thereby depriving the faithful of all the advantages of the ſcripture as he pretends: his *ob* has deceived him as uſual. This writer did not ſay, that theſe ſcriptures, divinely inſpired, uſeful *for doctrine*, *for argument*, *for correction*, and *for inſtruction*, ſhould be indiſcriminately put into the hands of every illiterate man and woman; he did not think it the duty of every man, who ſcarcely underſtands a line of a book, which he with great difficulty reads, to teach, to argue, to correct, or inſtruct; this he thought, and continues to think, the excluſive duty of the paſtors of the church, from them the ignorant and illiterate learn with eaſe the truths of religion, which even the moſt intelligent men cannot find in the ſcriptures. The apoſtle Paul thought ſo: Timothy, to whom he wrote and explained the uſe of the ſcriptures, was an archbiſhop, conſtituted by the apoſtle himſelf, not an ignorant peaſant, who could not read the apoſtle's letter. From him the faithful learned the contents of the apoſtle's letter, hence St. Paul ſaid to him in the preceding chapter: "*theſe things, which you have heard from me by many witneſſes, the ſame commend to faithful men, who will be capable of teaching others.*" He did not direct Timothy to give the ſcriptures to an immenſe multitude of people, of whom not one of a thouſand could read a line. This order, ſo offenſive to common ſenſe, was reſerved for the Wirtemberg evangeliſt and our Edinburg caſtigator. The Council of Trent coincides in opinion with

with the apoſtle: the prelates compoſing that Aſſembly thought it the indiſpenſable duty of the paſtors to inſtruct the faithful, to explain to them the genuine ſenſe of the ſcriptures, this duty they enjoined under the ſevereſt penalty, ch. i, ii, ſeſs. v. They had read ſomewhere that the *unlearned and the unſettled wreſt the ſcriptures to their own perdition*—2 Pet. iii. 16. Has the caſtigator found this paſſage in his copy? Or have the moths effaced it? Is it for depriving the unlearned and the unſettled of the ineſtimable advantage of wreſting the ſcriptures to their own perdition, that the Council of Trent has incurred his diſpleaſure? To theſe, and to theſe excluſively, the prohibition is confined. The Council ſaw the ſcriptures diſfigured in numberleſs verſions, and theſe ſources of chriſtianity poiſoned by artifice and impoſture. The author of each new verſion reſolving to impreſs on the minds of the people, his own pre-conceived opinions fitted his verſion for the purpoſe, hence the univerſal diſcordance of all theſe new verſions; for as their opinions were different, and each author fitting his verſion to his own opinions, their verſions were as diſcordant as their opinions were different. In one Engliſh verſion the *Holy Ghoſt* was excluded and the *Holy Wind* ſubſtituted. Of all theſe verſions Luther's was the moſt corrupt, and Chatellon's the moſt prophane: this fanatic, who with Bernard Ochinus thought to re-eſtabliſh polygamy, tranſlated the ſcriptures in the ſtyle of romance, regardleſs of decency, as well as truth. Our caſtigator inveighs moſt bitterly againſt the prohibition of theſe verſions; the keeper of a billiard table rails more loudly againſt the law, which prohibits gaming; the law is not the leſs wiſe nor the prohibition leſs neceſſary. The Council did not prohibit the reading of the ſcriptures in the original, to any perſon whatſoever, who underſtands the languages in which they are written, nor in the vulgar tongue, to any perſon capable of receiving edification from them. The permiſſion is granted by every paſtor when aſked. As the

reaſon

reaſon of the law has ceaſed amongſt Catholics, the law itſelf is going into diſuſe. If this diſpoſition of the Council of Trent had been ſtrictly obſerved, the world would not have been peſtered, nor chriſtianity diſgraced, by ſuch a group of illiterate mechanics and untaught peaſants converted into preachers; we ſhould not have ſeen the cobbler lay down his lap-ſtone, his laſt and his awls, and arm himſelf with a bible and hymn book to cobble the ſouls of his neighbours; nor ſhould we have ſeen theſe camp-meetings reſembling the orgies of Bacchus, and other nocturnal ſcenes, in which the rites of Ceres ſeem to be renewed. Be that as it will, in the cares of that venerable aſſembly, compoſed of the paſtors of Chriſt's church, we admire the vigilant attention of the Great Shepherd "*megas Poimên*" to the welfare of his flock. No ſooner were the waters of life infected by theſe poiſoners, of whom St. John ſays: *Foris Canes et venefici*, but his warning voice was heard from his paſtors, of whom he ſaid: "he who hears you, hears me:" *ô akouōn úmōn emou akouei*—Luke x, 16. In them ſources, ſaid he, the waters are not pure: do not taſte them; in them paſtures the poiſonous herbs grow promiſcuouſly with the ſound, avoid them. The writer appeals to the common ſenſe of mankind, is that an attentive ſhepherd, who permits his flock to drink waters iſſuing from a poiſoned ſpring? Or to range at large in paſtures where poiſonous herbs abound? If not, the Council of Trent was juſtified in prohibiting all corrupt verſions of the ſcriptures.

This writer had ſaid that many books of the ſcriptures had been loſt, in which aſſertion the caſtigator's *ob* diſcovers ſomething to authoriſe Deiſts in rejecting the ſcriptures, that is, becauſe ſome books were loſt, thoſe, which remain, are not authentic, becauſe ſome facts are forgotten, theſe which are remembered are not true. If the deep ſagacity of his *ob* had not diſcovered this neweſt mode of reaſoning, common ſenſe could never ſuſpect it. The writer paſſes unnoticed, a long differta-

tion,

tion filled with extracts as usual, to shew that the scriptures are not mutilated, in which the only thing worthy of remark is, an attempt to prove on the authority of primitive writers and others, a truth, which no man denies, that the scriptures are neither so far mutilated, nor corrupted, as to contain any thing contrary to faith or morals. He does not feel the inconsistency of appealing to an authority, which he disclaims, and his modesty, which is unrivalled, permits him to say that many of the Fathers were under the influence of prejudice and ignorance. Amongst these are numbered Justin, the philosopher, and Chrysostom, whose works are admired by the world. In this dissertation there is scarcely one observation founded in truth, but as it is totally irrelevant, and only serves to swell a volume with a display of borrowed literature, the writer does not think it necessary to consume time and paper in a refutation.

He gives some extracts from Austin and Chrysostom, who say, if we believe him, that all things which Christians are obliged to know are found in the scriptures. In Austin's words a moth had effaced the adverb *fére*, *almost*, and he totally forgot to inform his readers, that these Fathers when they recommended the reading of the scriptures to the most intelligent men amongst their people, directed them on doubtful or difficult passages to apply to the pastors of the church for the genuine sense of the inspired writer—See Austin's words, supra. And in his second book of the Christian Doctrine, cap. 6, he says: "they, who rashly read are deceived by many and manifold obscurities and ambiguities, taking one thing for another; and in some places they cannot find any thing to found even a false suspicion: Some things are so obscurely spoken that they induce the strictest cloud; this has been divinely provided, I doubt not, to tame pride by labour, and prevent that fastidious disesteem, which things easily investigated produce in the understanding." These are the scriptures

 which

which Auſtin recommends to the ignorant peaſant as a rule of faith and morality, if we believe this Edinburgh caſtigator! Chryſoſtom's ſentiments are not different from Auſtin's: in his 40th Homily on St. John, explaining this paſſage, *ſcrutinize the Scriptures*: "Chriſt," ſays he, "did not refer the Jews to a ſimple or a naked reading of the ſcriptures but to a diligent inveſtigation: he did not ſay: read the ſcriptures; but ſcrutinize them. The divine words require the greateſt diligence; it was not without reaſon that he ſpoke to theſe ancients in the ſhadow, hence he orders them to dig more deeply that we may find the things, which are deeply concealed; we do not dig up theſe things which are on the ſurface placed at hand, but theſe, which as a treaſure are deeply buried, he who ſeeks ſuch things, if he does not apply the greateſt diligence and labour, will never find what he ſeeks." In his third Homily on Lazarus, exhorting men of ſcience, of whom there were many in Conſtantinople, to read the ſcriptures, he replies to a ſilent objection:- "what then if we do not underſtand theſe things, which are contained in the books? though you do not underſtand the things there concealed, yet great ſanctity ariſes from the reading." He ſpoke of the hiſtorical events related in the ſcriptures, and theſe he ſaid were eaſily underſtood in part, for the obſcure parts he referred them to their teachers: "take the book in your hands," ſaid he, "read the whole hiſtory, the things which are known retain in memory; and read many times the things which are obſcure and not known, but if you cannot, by aſſiduous reading, find what is ſaid, conſult a more intelligent man, go to the teacher."

Who would imagine that our caſtigator would have recourſe to the teſtimony of the church? It is not more ſtrange than true, p. 232, he ſays, "in proving the canonical books genuine: we are far from rejecting the teſtimony of the church." The reader muſt admire the fertility of his imagination, when he finds that, though he admits the teſtimony of the church, it is not as the

teſtimony

teſtimony of the church but as the *evidence of faithful witneſſes*. It is unlucky that ſuch an effort of imagination, in which all his inventive powers have been ſtrained beyond the uſual pitch, ſhould leave this writer's argument inſoluble as it found it, and totally unhinge the Reformation, for the church is a ſociety, a moral body, which ſpeaks by its paſtors, as the State by its magiſtrates; the evidence, therefore, of *theſe faithful witneſſes*, is neither leſs nor more than the teſtimony of the church; the man is ripe for Bedlam, who denies it; he admits the teſtimony of the church as the evidence *of faithful witneſſes*; but they are the ſame witneſſes, who atteſt that all the doctrines taught in the catholic church are of divine original; the caſtigator ſays *they are faithful witneſſes*, therefore theſe doctrines are true, and there is an end of the Reformation. He will not preſume to call that man a faithful witneſs, who atteſts indiſcriminately both truth and falſhood. His *ob* ſuggeſts another evaſion, in abſurdity ſurpaſſing the former, if poſſible: it is not, he ſays, on the ground of infallibility that he believes this teſtimony of the Church, but becauſe it is the teſtimony of *faithful witneſſes*, who could not be deceived. Plain men, who have not *ob* for their director, believe this teſtimony on the ground of its infallibility. Such a teſtimony, ſay they, is infallibly true. For it is not poſſible that the teſtimony of *faithful witneſſes*, who could not be deceived, ſhould be falſe—the ſuppoſition involves a contradiction: for if they be not deceived, and advance a falſhood, they are not *faithful witneſſes*. Thus, on the teſtimony of the Church, or, as the caſtigator calls it, on the evidence of faithful witneſſes, catholics demonſtrate againſt atheiſts and deiſts, that theſe ſcriptures, which they call divine, are divinely inſpired; and, on the ſame evidence of faithful witneſſes, they demonſtrate againſt the caſtigator, and his aſſociates, that all theſe ſcriptures, and only theſe, which they call divine, are divinely inſpired. They proceed further on this evidence of faithful witneſſes, they ſhew the genuine and intended ſenſe of ambiguous paſſages, which impoſture diſtorts,

diſtorts, in ſupport of error; and, what will ſurpriſe the caſtigator's admirers, this tradition, which he hates, is neither leſs nor more than what he calls *the evidence of faithful witneſſes.* On this evidence the new fangled opinions of all reformiſts down from Simon the magician, to this Edinburgh caſtigator, have been condemned, this maxim repeatedly inculcated in the ſcriptures, has been invariably obſerved: "in the mouth of two or three witneſſes, ſhall every word be eſtabliſhed," 2 Cor. xiii. 1. A maxim known to the heathens, *teſtimonium pro ſe nec Catoni creditum.* Even Cato's teſtimony for himſelf is not believed. A maxim which without further diſcuſſion condemns every reformiſt: he gives teſtimony for himſelf, he deſerves no credit. Has this Edinburgh caſtigator ever beſtowed a ſerious thought on this maxim?

After admitting the teſtimony of the church, not as the teſtimony of the church, but as the *evidence of faithful witneſſes*, to prove the canonical books authentic; our caſtigator proceeds on other grounds to prove the inſpiration of the ſcriptures, that is, he does not believe theſe books divinely inſpired becauſe they were written or approved by the ſacred penmen, and as ſuch delivered into the hands of the paſtors whom the apoſtles conſtituted in the different churches, which they founded, whoſe teſtimony is continued in their ſucceſſors, theſe faithful witneſſes, who atteſt the fact, but he believes them divinely inſpired from the internal evidence of the books. His *ob* diſcovers the divine inſpiration of theſe books, whether they were writtten by *Peter* or *John*, *Eſop* or *Homer.* On the ſame ground, the Mahometan finds deciſive confirmation, as the caſtigator calls it, of the divine inſpiration of the *alcoran*, the Hindoo proves the *hanſcrit* divine, and every enthuſiaſt believes what pleaſes his fancy. The writer has known ſome well-meaning Proteſtants of the eſtabliſhed church, who believed the martyrdom of King Charles as divinely inſpired as the goſpel of St. John: why ſo? Becauſe they found it in the book, which they called their bible. He is weary of refuting ſuch nonſenſe. Our

Our caſtigator, the fertility of whoſe imagination is inexhauſtible, detects a miſtake of this writer. He had ſaid that "in no book of the ſcripture do we find that theſe books, which we call canonical were divinely inſpired." His *ob* deceives him, and he deceives his readers: this writer did not miſtake: for there is no book in the ſcriptures, nor is there a line in any book of the ſcriptures which ſays that theſe books, which we call canonical are divinely inſpired: for admitting that St. Paul ſpoke the nonſenſe, which Southwell impoſes on him, and inſtead of ſaying, as he did, that every writing divinely inſpired *paſa graphē theopneuſtos* is uſeful, he had ſaid: "*all ſcripture is given by inſpiration of God*," he did not ſay that any one of theſe books, which we call canonical is given by divine inſpiration. Southwell makes him ſay, that all divine ſcriptures are given by inſpiration of God, a heathen would not doubt it. In this fruitleſs attempt to fit a paſſage by a falſe verſion, the reader ſees a ſpecimen of the fidelity of modern tranſlators.

In the ſame page he ſays: "this writer cannot deny that the books of the Old Teſtament were received by our Lord and his apoſtles, as dictated by the Spirit of God." To this inſidious inſinuation, the writer replies, that impoſture ſubſiſts on the ſuppoſition of public credulity: if there was not ſimplicity there would be neither hypocriſy nor impoſture—*ad populos Phaleras, ego te novi intus et in cute.* This caſtigator has recourſe to every little ſubterfuge to evade the truth; and every artifice, which his *ob* ſuggeſts, to perplex it. As that fatal deluſion, which diſfigured chriſtianity, commenced in miſrepreſentation, he trys the ſame ſtratagem to continue it; it is an effort of agony, which forebodes an approaching diſſolution. Where did he read that this writer, or any other catholic, ever denied that the books of the old teſtament were received by our Lord and his apoſtles as dictated by the ſpirit of God? Why endeavour to obtrude on the credulity of his diſciples ſuch a flagrant falſehood? That the books of the New and Old

Teſtament

Teſtament are divinely inſpired, is an article of catholic faith, a term of catholic communion, this caſtigator, however ignorant, muſt know, the impoſture is therefore, intended; it ought to awake the victims of deluſion from their lethargy. But that theſe books are divinely inſpired, catholics do not know from the books themſelves, but from the teſtimony of theſe witneſſes, in whoſe hands the books were depoſited; and theſe the caſtigator injudiciouſly calls *faithful witneſſes, who could not be deceived*; yet however faithful they may be, their teſtimony would not found an act of faith, if it had not been guaranteed by Chriſt himſelf: "*he, who hears you, hears me*—Luke x, 16"; "*Behold I am with you all days until the conſummation of the age*"—Matt. ult. The voice of the Great Shepherd they hear from the mouth of his miniſters, and on his authority they found their faith; whilſt infatuated ſectaries hear from the mouth of their own miniſters, not his, the wild conjectures of every enthuſiaſt, and on theſe they found theſe jarring opinions, which by a monſtrous abuſe of language they call *faith*.

After citing ſome paſſages of ſcripture to ſhew, what no Chriſtian doubts, that the prophets were divinely inſpired, he ſays, in order to prove the inſpiration of the New Teſtament: "there is nothing more plainly revealed in ſcripture, than that thoſe perſons by whom it was written had received the Holy Ghoſt to qualify them to be witneſſes to Chriſt." What a nonſenſical jargon is here! Is it becauſe it is aſſerted in any writing that the author was inſpired we are to believe it? Was there ever an impoſtor who did not pretend a commiſſion from God? Did not the prophets of Baal, ſay to Achab and Jehoſophat *thus ſaith the Lord, choh amar Jehovah*, 2d. Chr. xviii, 9. If this Edinburgh caſtigator, inflated by his *ob*, ſhould take a fancy to give us a new goſpel, or a goſpel new-modelled, as Ethan Allen has done, we ſhould ſee in it that he was qualified by the ſpirit to be a witneſs to Chriſt, and would, no doubt,

find

find dupes to believe him, as Allen did, and as Jemima Wilkinſon, who calls herſelf the *Lord* in perſon, now does. It is a public fact that this woman has collected a number of people in the Janiſee country, who pay her homage as to Chriſt himſelf in perſon. She pretends to have died, and after the departure of her ſoul, Chriſt ſhe ſays took poſſeſſion of her body, and it is he himſelf who animates her body now. Human nature is ſo far degraded by fanatical enthuſiaſm that this woman finds credit. It is not from any writing that we conclude the author inſpired, he muſt have given other proofs of his miſſion from God, and theſe proofs muſt be ſenſible facts, that the witneſſes may be enabled to atteſt them on the teſtimony of their ſenſes. A writing of any kind is not a witneſs: it has neither eyes to ſee nor ears to hear, it can by no poſſibility authenticate itſelf or prove its author to have been inſpired. The tale of Jemima Wilkinſon, is not more abſurd than the aſſertion; nor is it more irkſome to refute the one than the other.

Our caſtigator has yet one reſource as a ſubſtitute to external evidence, from a multiplicity of words to which the reader muſt endeavour to fix ſome ſenſe, it appears to be the ſpirit of criticiſm, and to this he adds, the ſpirit of prophecy: "The hiſtory of kingdoms which are now no more;" the fiſhermen and farmers are well acquainted with the hiſtory of kingdoms now no more, and every illiterate mechanic is an able critic: he will diſtinguiſh revealed truth from artful impoſture by the modes of expreſſion and concurring circumſtances—*admiſſi Riſum teneatis amici*, but after all, this ſpirit of criticiſm is not ſcripture, and if proteſtants found an article of faith on it, that article of their faith is not founded on ſcripture; and many parts of the ſcripture relate paſt events, myſterious truths, maxims of morality, theſe we know to be divinely inſpired, becauſe we know by external evidence, that is by the teſtimony of faithful witneſſes, that their authors were divinely inſpired, in the ſame manner we know that the prophecies themſelves were fulfilled.

Of

Of many prophecies our caſtigator ſelects two from St. Paul; in the firſt the apoſtle foretells a great apoſtacy before the conſummation and the appearance of antichriſt or as St. Paul calls him *the Man of Sin*, *the Son of Perdition*; in the ſecond the apoſtle foretells, that in the la ter days ſome ſhall depart from the faith, giving heed to ſeducing ſpirits . . . forbidding to marry, and commanding to abſtain from meats. Who would imagine if the wonderful ſagacity of his *ob* had not diſcovered it, that this *Man of Sin*, *this Son of Perdition*, is neither leſs nor more than the *ſeducing ſpirits*, and *theſe ſeducing ſpirits* a ſucceſſion of Popes? But as Paul unluckily had ſaid that this *Man of Sin*, *this Son of Perdition*, whom the apoſtle thought to be a man not a ſpirit, "oppoſeth and exalteth himſelf above every thing called God, or which is worſhipped, ſo that he as God ſitteth in the temple of God, ſhewing himſelf that he is God."—2 Theſ. ii. Finding it difficult to fit this part of the prophecy to the Pope, who, with ſome appearance of humility, acknowledges himſelf to be a ſinner in the temple where he comes to adore God, and humbly confeſſes his ſins to his confeſſor in hopes of pardon, he fits the Pope to the prohecy, and, with that unbluſhing impudence, which characteriſes impoſture, tells his readers that this is the language of the church of Rome, "*the Lord our God the Pope another God upon earth*, ſays one, *the Pope*, ſays another, *is more than God*," the deſcription of antichriſt, given by St. Paul, fits the Pope juſt as well as Job's deſcription of the war-horſe fits this Edinburgh Aſs. To give the reader a ſpecimen of the arrogance of this Edinburgh ſcribbler, and juſtify ſome ſtrictures which may appear ſevere, the writer cites, from page 233, the following paſſage "many from miſtaken views of religion bequeathed their wealth to the church; not for the advancement of virtue and piety, but for ſupporting a clergy, *whoſe wallowings diſcovered more of the nature of the hog*, *than of the chriſtian paſtor*. That there were many individuals as well amongſt the clergy

as

as amongſt the laity, corrupt in their morals, when Luther commenced his reformation is true, of theſe, however, the Reformation purged the church: they became the firſt paſtors of all the reformed churches; and ſince that time ſuch men have always found a refuge from the ſeverity of catholic diſcipline, amongſt the paſtors of the reformed churches. Is this Edinburgh caſtigator one of the number? From ſeveral aukward attempts to wreſt, in ſupport of a defenceleſs opinion, the arguments, by which Catholics demonſtrate the ſcriptures authentic and divinely inſpired, the writer, is tempted to ſuſpect that, to ſatisfy the cravings of the belly, he, as well as the author of his repertory, has abjured the Catholic faith, of which ſome impreſſions yet remain; but as truth is ſtubborn and will not bend to countenance error, theſe aukward attempts to warp it, only remind us of the fable of the aſs in the lion's ſkin, the long ears and the braying, ſhewed the ſtupid animal under the terrific form.

His next attempt to faſhion the pope and metamorphoſe him into an antichriſt is amuſing enough, he teaches, he ſays, the doctrine of devils, prohibits marriage, and orders the people to abſtain from certain meats, Yet this ſame pope calls marriage a ſacrament, and papiſts contract marriages every day in the face of the church, and they eat all ſorts of meat with thankſgiving; and the better it is the more they like it. We have here another ſpecimen of that impoſture, which wreſts the ſcriptures from their intended ſenſe to countenance error; but as our caſtigator has been always unlucky in his citations, he is doubly unfortunate in the preſent inſtance: for if there be a paſſage in ſcripture, which damns him without redemption, or without the poſſibility of evaſion, it is that which he cites: the apoſtle ſays to his diſciple: "the ſpirit expreſsly ſays that in the latter times *ſome will apoſtatiſe from the faith*, attending to ſeducing ſpirits and doctrines of demons, ſpeaking lies in hypocriſy, having their conſciences ſeared; forbidding to marry *(command-*

ing) to abſtain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thankſgiving by them who believe and know the truth; for every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be refuſed if it be received with thankſgiving."—1ſt Tim. iv, 1 .... The apoſtle warns Timothy, and through him the church in Aſia, that many would apoſtatiſe from the faith; he at the ſame time deſcribes the moſt prominent doctrines of the Marcionites, who of all the ſects called '*Gnoſtics*,' *enlightened*, were the moſt corrupt; Marcion taught his diſciples to believe that there are two cauſes ſelf-exiſtent, eternal, of equal power, the one infinitely good, and the other infinitely and eſſentially bad; to the good cauſe, or God, he aſcribed the production of ſouls, which were all created, enlightened and happy; to the malignant cauſe he aſcribed the creation of bodies, of all the elements, and of all that is viſible, tangible or material in the univerſe; organized bodies were formed, if we believe Marcion, by this malignant cauſe to entangle the ſouls, which had been created happy, and to make them unhappy; to this artifice of the malignant principle he aſcribes all the calamities of man; but the malignant ſpirit, unable to deſtroy the activity of ſouls created by the good ſpirit, has endeavoured to fix them under his own dominion, by attaching them to this earth: to this end he has given them laws, promiſed rewards and threatened puniſhments, in caſe of diſobedience to himſelf, all this Marcion proves from the Old Teſtament, the work of the malignant cauſe, in it the rewards and puniſhments propoſed only tend to attach men to this viſible world; to diſſipate the illuſion, the good principle, God, aſſumed the appearance of humanity, propoſed rewards and puniſhments in the New Teſtament, his work, in order to break every attachment to this viſible world, and diſengage the ſouls, which he had created from the dominion and power of the malignant ſpirit. From theſe principles Marcion concluded that it is the indiſpenſable duty of all men to reſiſt every inclination

which

which attaches them to the world, and deſtroy all the works of the malignant ſpirit, who created it. Marriage was moſt ſtrictly prohibited in order to prevent the procreation of organized bodies, in which the malignant ſpirit entangles ſouls, and makes them ſubject to his dominion; nameleſs crimes, exceſſes the moſt abominable, were authoriſed to prevent the procreation of human bodies, leaſt the malignant ſpirit ſhould entangle happy ſouls in them. The Marcionites had the greateſt contempt for life, and the moſt deeply rooted averſion to that malignant God, whom they called the creator of this viſible world. Theodoret ſays, that he ſaw a Marcionite, aged 90 years, who felt the moſt ſenſible affliction when neceſſity compelled him to nouriſh his body with any of the productions of the earth? To eat any of the fruits, produced by the malignant ſpirit, was a humiliation to which he ſubmitted through meer neceſſity. *See Ter, con. Mar.* Theſe doctrines St. Paul condemns in a few words: he ſays, that marriage is not only lawful but honorable; that every creature of God is good. What catholic ever doubted it? He did not condemn or cenſure the virtues of perpetual chaſtity, and continency, which Chriſt himſelf practiſed and recommended, nor did he condemn theſe voluntary mortifications, which he himſelf practiſed to reduce his body to ſubjection; that faſting and prayer, by which alone the unclean ſpirit is caſt out. Have the moths effaced from the caſtigator's copy of the teſtament that paſſage in which Chriſt ſays, that the dumb and deaf ſpirit cannot be expelled but by *faſting and prayer*—"*touto to genos en oudeni dunatai exelthein ei mē en Proſeuchē kai Neſteia.*"—Mark ix, 29. The writer ſhrewdly ſuſpects that the Edinburgh caſtigator's *ob* is one of that claſs. His averſion to chaſtity ſhews him to be an unclean ſpirit; and his deeply rooted hatred to faſting and prayer proves him to be of that very claſs of unclean ſpirits, which, as the Saviour ſays, are expelled but by faſting and prayer.

After a diſplay of wit on the the celibacy of the clergy,

clergy, and these unprofitable austerities of fasting, abstinence and prayer, so hateful to the disciples of Epicurus, the castigator observes the great use of prophecy, since from it he is "enabled to conclude that the pope is antichrist, and the scriptures are the word of God,"—p. 242. The writer acknowledges the great use of prophecy, more particularly this prophecy of St. Paul, which the castigator has cited: from it he concludes that the castigator's *ob* is one of them seducing spirits, of which the apostle spoke. This conclusion is not founded on that nonsensical jargon, which converts one man into many spirits, and many spirits into a succession of popes, it is founded on the apostles' words, understood in the plain literal sense, in which every man must understand them: the apostle says: "*some will apostatize from the faith*," "*apostesontai tines tēs pisteos.*" If some will depart from the faith, others will persevere in it: otherwise the apostle would not have said *some*, "*tines*," but *all*, "*pantes*," and it would not have been a departure of some from the faith, but the total destruction of the faith. Did the catholic pastors and people at any time depart from the church of this castigator, its descriptive title the writer does not know? Was it at any time the church of all nations, from which all other sects originally departed? No, our castigator informs us, that his ancestors were expelled from the communion of the Romish church—p. 142. He adds, that it was for their adherence to the truths of religion they were expelled from the Romish church: there never was a sect, which did not assign the same reason, but it is not the less true, that they were in it, or they could not be expelled from it. They therefore are not that church from which the apostle said some would depart: they departed from it, the faith continued in it, and this castigator's *ob* is one of these seducing spirits, which makes its last exertions to continue a delusion, originally founded on imposture. Against this reasoning wild declamation is vain: tales of popes and friars, whether true or false, may amuse idleness

idleneſs or gratify malignity, but they cannot falſify the apoſtle's words : *ſome will depart from the faith.* Some, not all : they who form new conventicles depart : it is the ſhip which departs from the ſhore : he muſt be ſtupid indeed, who cannot make the reflection, and his inſenſibility muſt be great if he does not feel it.

This ſpirit of criticiſm, which diſcovers the divine inſpiration of the ſcriptures in the mode of expreſſion, and this prophecy which enables him to conclude that every pope is antichriſt, though the apoſtle knew but one, do not entirely ſatisfy him, they produce a rational perſuaſion, but not divine faith : " there may be," he ſays, p. 242, " a rational perſuaſion of the divine inſpiration of the ſcriptures, where divine faith is wanting." The cauſe is deſperate ; after many ſtruggles he gives it up : it is not an article of his faith that the ſcriptures are divinely inſpired, it is but a *rational perſuaſion.*

If it be not an article of faith that the ſcriptures are divinely inſpired, it is not a ſin againſt faith to deny it. The propoſition is evident ; if it be not a ſin againſt faith to deny that the ſcriptures are divinely inſpired, it is not a ſin againſt faith to deny that any article contained in them is divinely inſpired. This propoſition is not leſs manifeſt than the former : for it ſurpaſſes abſurdity to ſay, that the articles contained in the ſcriptures are divinely inſpired, and the ſcriptures themſelves are not. Hence it follows that in the doctrine expreſsly taught by this new-modelled Edinburgh preacher, a man may be a Chriſtian, who does not believe a word of the goſpel ; he had already told us that a man may be a Saint of God though conſiderably involved in the pollutions of ſin. Impiety cannot go further.

After filling four or five pages with paſſages of ſcripture, which have no reference whatever to the ſubject under diſcuſſion, interſperſed with ſtupid obſervations, looſe and unconnected, to which, if any determinate ſenſe can be affixed, it is that faith is a gift of God. What Chriſtian ever denied, or even doubted it ? Theſe

obſervations

obſervations, he ſays, ſhew how a man, who never read the ſcriptures, may know the truths contained in them to be the word of God—p. 246; he ought to have told us how the proteſtant, who takes the ſcriptures for a ſole and ſufficient rule of faith, knows that theſe truths, which he believes to be the word of God, are contained in the ſcriptures. This is the embarraſſing queſtion, from which, by a multiplicity of unmeaning words, he endeavours to divert the attention of his readers. The writer tells him once more that, if the proteſtant, who does not read the ſcriptures, knows the truths, which he believes to be the word of God, to be contained in them, he muſt know it either on the teſtimony of thoſe, who read them, or by divine inſpiration. There is no mean, and, in either caſe, the ſcriptures are not his rule of faith.

Our caſtigator continues his obſervations on the powerful influence of the ſcriptures over the minds of men, as if Catholics doubted it; but they tell him, that the ſcriptures have no influence over the minds of men, who know nothing of their contents, the man who believes it muſt be as ſtupid as this caſtigator. He cites paſſages from Auſtin and Juſtin. The former ſays that his converſion was effected by reading an epiſtle of St. Paul, and the latter ſays: that the Chriſtian doctrine poſſeſſes a certain innate majeſty both to terrify and allure the ſinner. Theſe extracts are as much to the purpoſe as extracts from the alcoran. Was Auſtin an illiterate man? Was Juſtin a man who could not read? Does he intend to perſuade us that Chriſt ſpilled his blood but for the very few, who are capable of underſtanding the ſcriptures? The writer is weary of refuting theſe little arts by which this caſtigator deludes the uninformed.

After theſe obſervations, our caſtigator, who knows no end of tranſcribing, fills two pages with an extract from the writer's *Remarks*, in which St. Auſtin's reaſoning againſt the Manicheans is ſtated, to which, after ſome coarſe invectives againſt popes and papiſts, he replies

plies " that though St. Auſtin had actually viewed all faith as founded on the teſtimony of the church, it by no means follows as a conſequent that his ſentiments are juſt, p. 249. After citing ſome paſſages from that Father, which have the ſame tendency, and only ſerve to confirm the writer's remarks, blending ignorance with artifice, he attempts an evaſion, by wreſting Auſtin's words from their natural ſignification, and the only ſenſe which they can bear: Auſtin ſays: " I would not believe the goſpel unleſs the authority of the *univerſal* Church induced me." In quoting theſe words, he ſays, the writer had omitted the term *univerſal*, which is true and with unuſual ſagacity he diſcovers that Auſtin did not found his belief on the *teſtimony* of the church, but on the *univerſality* of the teſtimony. A plain man, not poſſeſſed by this caſtigator's *ob*, could not diſcover this *univerſality of teſtimony* in Auſtin's words at all. He ſpeaks of the *authority* of the Catholic church, not a word of the *univerſality of its teſtimony*: " *Eccleſiæ Catholicæ Auteorias.*"

This ſection the caſtigator cloſes with ſtrictures on the writer for attempting, as he impudently aſſerts, to deſtroy the authority of the ſcriptures through intereſted views; the writer eaſily conceives, why a ſelf-conſtituted paſtor, engaged in the propagation of the human ſpecies, as his moſt indiſpenſable duty, finding an honorable ſupport for a family in the ſimplicity of his admirers, ſhould feel ſeriouſly alarmed at any attempt to diſſipate the deluſion; but why he ſhould lend theſe motives, which operate ſo powerfully on himſelf, to a man, who has not the ſame inducements, is not ſo eaſily conceived: they were not teachers ſubject to the ſeverity of catholic diſcipline, whom the apoſtle introduced, ſaying: " by this craft we have our wealth."

He opens the next ſection by expoſing the views of the Romiſh church: " ſhe is conſcious," he ſays, " that many of her doctrines are inconſiſtent with the plaineſt principles of religion." The reader muſt not ſuſpect him of

of calumny : his *ob* inſpires him, and enables him to detect the views of men, though concealed from the eyes of the world ; and it is to ſupport theſe doctrines that ſhe has invented tradition. This tradition conveys a terrific idea, and what makes it doubly alarming is, that both the term and the idea, which it conveys, is of the moſt venerable antiquity ; by this tradition all the errors and hereſies, which have disfigured chriſtianity ſince the apoſtles' days, have been refuted and condemned, and their authors conſigned to infamy ;—ſee Tertullian's reaſoning, *Remarks*, p. 142, and Ireneus's, p. 93, in this work. To theſe the writer adds an extract from *Baſil the Great*, a writer, who though his authority may not be equal to that of this Edinburgh caſtigator's *ob*, has been conſidered as one of the moſt intelligent, eloquent and pious writers whom the chriſtian world has yet produced. The writer of his life, a ſevere critic, ſays of Baſil : "His ſtyle is elevated and majeſtic, his reaſoning profound, his erudition extenſive ; his writings were read by all people even the heathens, they compared him to the moſt celebrated orators of antiquity ; and he may be equalled to the moſt eloquent fathers of the church. From his book on the Holy Ghoſt, which St. Jerom, calls an egregious work, the writer gives a tranſcript in the original now before him. " Tōn en te ekkleſia pephulagmenōn dogmatōn ta men ek tes agraphou didaſkalias echomen, ta de ek tōn apoſtolōn paradoſeos diadothenta ēmin en muſteriō paradexametha. áper amphotera ten autēn iſchun echei pros tēn euſebeian kai toutois oudeis anterei óſtis ge kàn kata mikron goun theſmon ekkleſiaſtichōn pepeiratai. Ei gar epicheireſamen tà agrapha tōn ethōn ōs ou megalēn echonta tēn dunamin paraiteiſthai lathoimen an eis auta ta kairia zemiountes to euaggelion, inallon de eis onoma pſilon periiſtontes to kerugma, óion ina tou protou kai koinotatou proton mnēſthō tō tupō tau ſtorau tous eis to onoma, tou kuriou èmon Jeſou Chriſtou elpikotas kataſémaineſthai tis ō dia grammatos didaxas ; to pros anatolas petrapthai kata ten proſeuchēn poion edidaxen

émas

êmas grammata tês epiklēſeōs remata epi anadeîxei tou artou euchariſtias ē tou potēriou tês eulogias tis tōn âgiōn eggraphōs ēmin kataleloipen; ou gar de toutois arkoumetha, ōn ô apoſtolos ē to euaggelion epemnēſthē, alla kai prolegomen kai epilogomen etera ōs megalēn, echonta pros to muſtêrion tēn iſchun ek tēs agraphou didaſkaliōs paralabontes. Eulogoumen de to ûdōr tou Baptiſmatos kai to elaion tês Chryſeos kaï proſeti auton ton baptizomenon apo poion eggraphōn; ouk apo tês fiōpōmenēs kai muſtikes paradoſeōs, ti de auten tou elaiou tēn Chriſen tis logos gegrammenos edidaxe; to de tris baptizesthai ton anthropon pothen; alla de ōſa per to Baptiſma apotaſſeſthai tō Satana kai tois aggelois autou ek poias eſti graphes; ouk ek tēs ademoſieutou toutes kai aporretou didaſkalias ēn en apolupragmōnētō, aperiergaſtô ſigê ôi pateres ēmon ephulaxan kalôs ekeinoi dedidagmenoi tōn muſteriōn ta ſemma fiōpē diaſōſeſthai â gar oude epopteuein exeſti amuetois toutōn pōs an ēn eikos tēn didaſkalian thriambeueinai en grammaſin."

" Of inſtitutions obſerved in the church we have ſome from written doctrine, and ſome delivered to us from the tradition of the apoſtles, both which have the ſame tendency to piety, and theſe no man contradicts, if he be in the leaſt converſant with eccleſiaſtical laws: for if we attempt to ſet aſide unwritten cuſtoms as having no great force, we imprudently hurt the goſpel in its principal parts, and reduce preaching to an empty name. For to aſſign firſt, what is firſt and moſt common, who in writing has taught that they, who hope in the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt are to be ſigned by the figure of the Croſs? To turn to the eaſt in prayer, what writing has taught us? The words of invocation over the oblation of the bread of the euchariſt, or the chalice of benediction, who of the ſaints has left us in writing? For we are not content with theſe, which are remembered by the apoſ-

tle, and the goſpel, but both before and after, we ſay others, as having great virtue towards the myſtery, and which we have received from unwritten doctrine; we bleſs the water of baptiſm and the oil of unction, and alſo the perſon to be baptiſed, from what writing? Is it not from ſecret and myſtical tradition? And the unction of oil, what written word has taught it? To immerſe the perſon thrice, whence is it? And whatſoever other things concerning baptiſm as to renounce Satan and his angels, from what writing is it? Is it not from that doctrine not publicly ſpoken, which our fathers in peaceful ſilence, free from vain curioſity, preſerved? And they themſelves, well inſtructed to preſerve the gravity of myſteries in ſilence. How is it veri-ſimilar that the doctrine of theſe things, which are not to be ſeen by them, who are not initiated, would be triumphantly ſhewn in writings."

After ſaying that Moſes did not expoſe to public view, the rites and ceremonies practiſed in the temple, Baſil aſſigns the reaſon, why doctrines taught, and rites inſtituted by the apoſtles, were not committed to writing at all. Kata ton auton de tropon deôi ta peri tas ekſileſias exarchês diatheſmothetêſantes apoſtoloi de patres en tô kekrummono de aphthegēto to ſemnon tois muſteriois ephulaſſon oude gar alós muſterion to eis tén demodé kai eikaian akouèn ekphoroun, ôutos ò logos tés tén agraphôn paradoſeós ós mē katamelletê heiſan tón dogmatón gnoſin eukatophroneten tois pollois geneſthai dia ſunetheia: allo gàr dogma allo kerugma. Ta men gar dogmata ſiopatai ta de kerugmata demoſieuetai ſiopes de eidos kai aſapheia é kechrêtai ê graphe duſtheôreton katoſkeuaxouſa tôn dogmatòn ton noun pros to tén entugchanton Luliteles." In the ſame manner the apoſtles and fathers in the commencement, inſtituting rites and things concerning the churches, preſerved in ſecret and in ſilence their majeſty to the myſteries: for that is not altogether a myſtery, which is brought to public and common hearing.

hearing. This is the reaſon of the tradition of unwritten things, that the neglected knowledge of rites may not become contemptible to many from cuſtom: a rite is one thing, a doctrine is another, rites are paſſed in ſilence, doctrines are publiſhed. There is a ſecret of ſilence and obſcurity, which the ſcripture uſes pre-diſpoſing the ſenſe of inſtitutions, ſo that it is with difficulty diſcovered, and that for the advantage of them who find it." He then enumerates many rites inſtituted by the apoſtles, and ſays: epileipſe me ēmera ta agrapha tes ekkleſias muſteria diēgoumenon. Eó ta alla, auten de tên ômologian tès pisteos pisteuein eis patera kai úion kai ágion pneuma ek poion grammatón eckomen. The day would fail me relating the unwritten myſteries of the church. I omit other things; the very confeſſion of faith, to believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, from what writings have we it? Lib. de Sp. ſan. Cap. 27*.

Our Edinburgh caſtigator would have told him that the moſt illiterate of his new-modelled converts finds it in the ſcriptures. How wonderfully the world has been enlightened by theſe new teachers! What Baſil the Great could not find in the new teſtament, though written in his native language, in the language which he had learnt from his mother, every diſciple of the new ſchool finds in the Engliſh verſion! And, what to all plain men ſeems incredible, even they, who have yet their alphabet to learn.

How this venerable Greek would ſtare, if he were told that all theſe rites and ceremonies, which he, on the teſtimony of his predeceſſors, believed to have been inſtituted by the apoſtles, were popiſh ſuperſtitions, and this unwritten tradition invented by the pope in ſupport of them! This great prelate, revered by the Chriſtian world, died in the year 379, that is two hundred and eleven years before Gregory the Great began to govern the church, after whoſe death the

pope

pope was converted into Antichrift by the impoſture of an impudent monk.

Be that as it will, Baſil informs us thattheſe rites and ceremonies, which the caſtigator derides, becauſe they are not found in the ſcriptures, were inſtituted by the apoſtles,and affigns the reaſon why they were not written, but tranſmitted by oral tradition to the paſtors in ſucceſſion; ſome eleven or twelve hundred years before Calvin or Knox had enlightened the world with their lucubrations; and ſo univerſally was it believed that theſe rites were of apoſtolical inſtitution, that no man in the leaſt converſant with eccleſiaſtical diſcipline was found to conteſt it; he alſo informs us that doctrines of faith were founded on this apoſtolical tradition: beginning his ſeventh chapter of that celebrated work on the Holy Ghoſt, he ſays: ēdē de kai peri tou ágiou pneumatos tas koinos ēmōn ennoias apoiai tines eiſin exetaſomen tas te ek tōn graphōn peri auton ſunactheiſas ēmin kai as ek tás agraphou paradoſeōs tōn patrōn diediedexametha," and now concerning the Holy Ghoſt we ſhall examine our common notions of what nature ſome are concerning him; theſe are collected by us from the ſcriptures, and thoſe we have received from the unwritten tradition of the fathers.

In his 29th chapter in reply to an exception taken againſt the doxology on which he had founded a proof of the divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, Baſil ſays, pros ge men amarturon kai agraphon einai tên ſun tō pneumatî doxologian ekeino legomen, âti ei men méden eteron agraphon mêde auto paradechthēto ei de ta pleista tōn muſtion agraphōs émin empoliteuetai ineta pollōn eterōn kai auto katadexometha, apoſtolikon de oimai de to tais agraphois paradoſeiſi paramenein; as to the doxology (with the Holy Ghoſt) being unatteſted and unwritten this we ſay: if there be nothing elſe unwritten let that alſo be not received; but if many myſteries are received by us without writing, let us receive this with many others. I think it is apoſtolical

to

to perſevere in unwritten traditions. He then cites the following paſſage from St. Paul's epiſtle 1ſt. C. xi. 2. epainō gar pheſin ûmas ôti panta mou menmēſthe kai kathōs paredōka ûmin tas paradoſeis katechete. I praiſe you, ſays he, (P.) becauſe you remember all things of mine and as I delivered to you, you hold the traditions." To this paſſage, from the firſt to the Corinthians, he immediately ſubjoins the following paſſage from the ſecond to the Theſſalonians, ii. 14. kai te krateite tas paradoſeis as paralabete eite dia logou eite di epiſtolas; and this, " hold faſt the traditions which you have received, whether by word or by letter ;" he then ſhews that though the doxology be not found in Scripture it is not the leſs certain as it is found in the writings of theſe, who were inſtructed by the apoſtles and their immediate ſucceſſors, he cites Clement of Rome, Ireneus, Dennis of Rome, Dennis of Alexandria, &c.

Of all the great writers of antiquity, there is not one of greater weight and authority than Baſil, and he atteſts that theſe rites and ceremonies, which impoſture impudently pretends to have been invented by popes ſome centuries after his death, were religiouſly obſerved in his time, and believed to be of apoſtolical inſtitution, the ſame truth is atteſted by the few writers who preceded Baſil, and whoſe works are yet extant. Tertullian, in his book on the ſoldiers' crown, ſays: we make oblations for the dead, and for our birth on the annual day; we think it a crime to faſt on Sunday ..... at going out and coming in, at putting on our cloths and our ſhoes .... we wear our forehead with the ſign of the croſs, of theſe and many other cuſtoms if you aſk the law from the ſcriptures you will find none. Tradition is offered as founding, cuſtom confirming and faith obſerving. Cap. 4.

A ſimilar teſtimony is given by Clement of Alexandria, a writer more ancient than Tertullian by ſome years, and of more unqueſtionable authority: they," ſays he, " who preſerved the true tradition of holy doctrine

doctrine from the holy apoſtles Peter, James, John and Paul, as a ſon receives from their father, [few ſons are like their fathers] through the will of God, arrived at our time to depoſit with us, the apoſtolical ſeeds received from anceſtors. He did not reveal to the many theſe things, which did not belong to the many, but to the few, whom he knew fit to receive them and be formed by them," Sh. Lib. 1.

Clement had ſtudied under the celebrated Pantenus, and ſucceeded him in the Chriſtian ſchool at Alexandria, founded by the evangeliſt St. Marc. His works Jerom calls *inſignia volumina plena eruditionis & eloquentiæ, remarkable works, full of erudition and eloquence.* In the ſchool founded by the evangeliſt he had learned that Chriſt did not think it neceſſary to reveal to the multitude the rites and ceremonies, by which the biſhops and other miniſters of his church are inſtituted, nor the rites and ceremonies to be obſerved by them in the celebration of the divine myſteries and adminiſtration of ſacraments committed to them, not to the multitude; and we know from Baſil that in his time theſe rites were not committed to writing at all. This injunction of St. Paul to his diſciple Timothy, " *theſe things which you have heard from me by many witneſſes the ſame commit to faithful men, who will be capable of teaching others,*" 2. Tim. ii. 2, was obſerved by other biſhops as well as by that prelate: they did not write theſe things for the multitude becauſe it was not the duty of the multitude to teach others, it was their duty to learn; but they committed them to faithful men, whoſe duty it was to teach others. Thus the chief paſtors tranſmitted the doctrines, the rites and ceremonies, which they had learned from their predeceſſors, to their ſucceſſors in office.

Ignatius, a diſciple of St. John the Evangeliſt, biſhop of Antioch, on his way to Rome, where he ſuffered for the faith; exhorted the faithful in the different cities through which he paſſed to perſevere in the *traditions*

of

of the apoſtles Euſebius, His. Ec. lib. 3. cap. 36. ſays of him, "Ignatius, who, ſecond after Peter, obtained the chair of Antioch when he was conducted through Aſia, under a ſtrict guard of ſoldiers confirming the churches in the ſeveral cities through which he paſſed, admoniſhed them in the firſt place to beware of the corrupt opinions of ſectaries. which then began to come to light and to ſpread widely; he exhorted them to adhere with firmneſs to the traditions of the apoſtles, which for the more certain knowledge of poſterity he thought it neceſſary to commit to writing, confirmed by his teſtimony."

The letters of this apoſtolical patriareh are yet extant: he ſtrictly and repeatedly recommends unity of ſentiment, and obedience to biſhops, prieſts and deacons. Our Edinburgh caſtigator, with the neweſt modelled modeſty, tells us on the veracity of his *ob*, that his new church, in which their is neither biſhop, prieſt nor deacon, has re-aſſumed the form of this primitive church. This is, perhaps, the moſt groſs impoſition that ever was obtruded on public credulity.

In order, if poſſible, to undeceive many well-meaning and piouſly diſpoſed perſons, who are the victims of their own ſimplicity, the writer adds to the teſtimony of theſe venerable prelates of the Greek church, againſt whom no exception can be ſtared, the teſtimony of the greateſt Latin writers which the Chriſtian world knows.

St. Auſtin in his fifth Book on Baptiſm againſt the Donatiſts, cap. 23. n. 31. ſays, "that cuſtom which was oppoſed to Cyprian muſt be believed to have taken its beginning from their (the apoſtles') tradition, as there are many other things which the whole church holds and for this are juſtly believed to have been commanded by the apoſtles though they are not found written."

Jerom in his book againſt the Luciferians, introduces the Luciferian advancing a truth which he endeavoured

ed to wreſt in ſupport of error: "do not you know," ſays the Luciferian, "this to be the cuſtom of churches that after baptiſm hands are impoſed on the baptiſed, and the Holy Ghoſt thus invoked! You aſk where it is written? In the Acts of the Apoſtles; but if for this the authority of the ſcripture were not found, the conſent of the whole world is as a precept; for many other things are obſerved in the church on tradition, which have obtained the authority of written law." To this Jerom replies; "I do not deny the cuſtom of the church .... but why is it that you transfer the laws of the church to hereſy? he then ſhews that though it be the eſtabliſhed and univerſal cuſtom of the church for the biſhop to impoſe hands on the baptiſed to invoke the Holy Ghoſt, it is not the leſs true that the grace of the Holy Ghoſt is conferred in baptiſm. This power of impoſing hands, that is, of adminiſtering the Sacrament of Confirmation is reſerved to the Biſhop, he ſays, for the honour of the prieſthood. Theſe are his words, "the ſafety of the church depends on the dignity of the chief prieſt; for if there be not ſome extraordinary and eminent power given to him there will be as many ſchiſms in the church as prieſts." Hence it is that without the *Chriſm* and the biſhop's order, neither prieſt nor deacon has a right to baptiſe though it be allowed when neceſſity compels even for the laity to do it." He proves that the grace of the Holy Ghoſt is conferred in baptiſm from the baptiſm of the eunuch by Philip the deacon, on whom the Holy Ghoſt immediately deſcended without the impoſition of the biſhop's hands, Acts viii. 38. that this power is reſerved to the biſhops is manifeſt from a fact related in the ſame chapter; for when Samaria had received the word, though the converts there had been baptiſed by Philip, and had received the Holy Ghoſt as the eunuch did without any viſible ſigns, yet the Holy Ghoſt did not viſibly deſcend on any one of them till Peter and John had impoſed hands on them. The caſtigator

can not

cannot find in the ſcriptures that this impoſition of hands, by which the grace of the Holy Ghoſt is conferred on the baptiſed Chriſtian, is a ſacrament. There are none ſo blind as they, who will not ſee. This unction too, and theſe other ceremonies of baptiſm, which he derides, were as univerſally obſerved by the Latins as the Greeks, Jerom is a witneſs for the one, and Baſil for the other.

Hilarius, a deacon more rigid than other Luciferians, would not acknowledge the Arian baptiſm, though in the common form, valid, of him Jerom ſays: "Hilarius as he has receded from the church a deacon, and is himſelf, as he thinks, the people of the world, cannot conſecrate the euchariſt, having neither biſhops nor prieſts .... As the man is now dead the ſect died with him, becauſe a deacon could not ordain a clergyman after him, and that is not a church which has not a prieſt, but to paſs unnoticed a few worthleſs men, who are to themſelves both biſhops and laity, hear what you are to believe of the church." He then deſcribes the Catholic church ſuch as it was then, ſuch as it is now, and ſuch as it will be until the conſummation, and finally concludes, : "in that church you muſt remain, which, founded by the apoſtles, continues until this day. If you hear thoſe, who are ſaid to belong to Chriſt, named not after our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, but after ſome other, as Marcionites, Valentianiſts, Montaniſts, or Campaniſts, know that it is not the church of Chriſt but the ſynagogue of Antichriſt: for by this alone that they have been ſince inſtituted they ſhew themſelves to be the ſectaries foretold by the apoſtle; and let them not flatter themſelves if from ſome paſſages in the ſcriptures they ſeem to confirm what they ſay, ſince the devil himſelf ſpoke ſome things from the ſcriptures, and the ſcriptures do not conſiſt in the reading but in the underſtanding: for if we follow the letter, we may alſo compoſe a new doctrine and refuſe to admit into the church them who have ſhoes on their feet, or two coats," Dial. Con. Luci.

Our caſtigator, who in vain ſought his anceſtors amongſt the Wickleſites, the Huſſites, the Waldenſes, and even amongſt us idolatrous Papiſts, would have found them in Hilarius' ſect, in which there was neither biſhop nor prieſt. It is true Jerom ſays the ſect died with him, but it is revived in this Edinburgh caſtigator's little church, and the form re-aſſumed.

St. Auſtin, de. Reg. Ex. Cap. 52, ſays: "perſons baptiſed amongſt heretics, who baptiſe in the confeſſion of the Holy Trinity and come to us, are received as baptiſed, leſt the invocation or confeſſion of the Holy Trinity be annulled, but they are taught and well inſtructed in what ſenſe the myſtery of the Holy Trinity is held in the church. If they conſent to believe and acquieſce to confeſs, being already purified, let them be confirmed in the integrity of the faith by *the impoſition of hands*; if they be children, or ſo ſtupid that they cannot learn the doctrine, let theſe, who offer them, anſwer for them, according to the cuſtom of the perſon to be baptiſed, and thus ſtrengthened by *the impoſition of hands* and the *chriſm*, let them be admitted to the myſteries of the euchariſt," the unction of chriſm, which this caſtigator, in deriſion, calls greaſe, was therefore religiouſly obſerved in the primitive church, though not mentioned in the ſcriptures. This venerable, learned and pious prelate, St. Auſtin, in his homilies to the new Chriſtians, explains all the ceremonies of baptiſm now obſerved in the Catholic church, which this caſtigator, whoſe petulance is equalled but by his ignorance, in coarſe and offenſive terms, impudently derides.

From theſe extracts, not tranſcribed from a repertory, in which the works of eminent writers are garbled and faſhioned by impoſture, but from the works themſelves now before the writer, the reader will ſee with what appearance of truth this Edinburgh caſtigator confidently aſſerts that theſe ceremonies are of popiſh invention, and tradition invented to ſupport them.

If any man upon cool reflection can prevail on himſelf to

to believe that all these great writers of different countries, so eminent in science and venerable for sanctity, in whose doctrine there is such a perfect coincidence, have been deceived, or have combined to deceive the world, and that half a dozen profligate and petulant monks, renouncing their vows and promises to gratify their passions, in whose opinion there is nothing but contradictions, each as inconsistent with the other, as they are all with truth, have been sent to undeceive the world, his infatuation is lamentable indeed.

After shewing, as he imagines, that the rites of administering the sacraments of baptism, and the eucharist, and of instituting *the Officers* of the church, are distinctly taught in the scriptures, though not one of these great writers of antiquity could find them there, and the most intelligent, as we have already seen, say they are not there, the castigator tells us that the observance of the sabbath was a Jewish peculiarity, this, he says, did not occur to the writer. True it did not occur to him: he had read somewhere: "and God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it: because on it he had rested from all his works," Gen. ii. 3. This sabbath which the castigator's *ob* discovers to have been a Jewish peculiarity, was, if Moses tell truth, sanctified and consecrated to the divine service, some two thousand years before Abraham, the father of the Jewish nation, was born; and in the xx of Exodus, Moses assigns the same reason as he did in the ii of Genesis: "in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that in them are, and rested the seventh day, and, wherefore, Jehovah blessed the seventh day and sanctified it."

In the 5th of Deuteronomy he assigns an additional reason why he enjoins so strict an observance of the Sabbath in the Jews, "that thy man-servant, and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou, and remember that thou wast a servant in the Land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out from thence with a strong hand."

The benefit of the creation was common to all, to the Gentiles,

Gentiles, as to the Jews, the obligation of paying due homage to the Creator founded on the benefit of the creation, equally common; hence this positive precept universally obliged, from the time of the creation; the deliverance from the Egyptian bondage was an additional favour conferred on the Jews, which did not diminish the benefit conferred on all mankind by the Creation, nor the obligation of acknowledging it by the sactification of the sabbath. This precept, therefore, did not commence with the ceremonial law of the Jews, and if it terminated with it, it was because the same God who had ordered the sanctification of the seventh day, in commemoration of the creation, transferred the obligation to the first day in commemoration of a yet greater benefit, that is, the redemption; and this we know not from the scriptures, but from tradition.

With respect to the institution of the first day, says the castigator, p. 261, both the language and conduct of the apostles can be exhibited to its being appropriated to divine worship; it is not, therefore, in the scriptures that he finds this institution: he deduces it from the language and conduct of the apostles. How will the illiterate protestant, not gifted with the castigator's *Ob*, nor blessed with his powers of divination, deduce from the language and conduct of the apostles, the moral obligation of sanctifying the first day of the week, whilst he finds the obligation of sanctifying the seventh day expressly stated and repeatedly inculcated in the scriptures? Is he not told that he will find every truth of faith, and every moral obligation distinctly taught in his rule of faith, the scriptures? After all this, the castigator, with all his powers of divination, cannot deduce this truth from the language and conduct of the apostles. The passages which he cites do not support the deduction: in the original it is thus written: "*en de tē mia tōn sabbatōn*," that is, "*on one of the sabbaths*," or as *mia* does not correspond with *sabbaton*, supposing *ēmera* understood "*on one day of the sabbaths*," which very naturally signifies "*one sabbath day*," not the

the firſt day of the week; if therefore it be underſtood of the firſt day of the week, it is becauſe tradition has tranſmitted to us the ſenſe intended by St. Paul. Recourſe may be had to the rhetorical figure Synecdoche and to Hebraiſms, in which the cardinal number ſupplies the place of the ordinal, and the plural is taken for the ſingular, but this is a forced conſtruction, and not within the reach of the unlearned.

Suppoſing it as certain from the text, independently on the ſenſe which tradition has affixed to it, as it is uncertain that *mia tōn ſabbatôn* ſignifies the firſt day of the week, and that "*klaſai arton*," which in plain Engliſh ſignifies *to break bread*, implies *to communicate* or make the communion, from what principle does he conclude that this firſt day was not only appropriated to divine ſervice, but alſo ſubſtituted to the ſeventh day, which was conſecrated to divine ſervice from the commencement of time? The ſacred penman ſays, Acts ii, 46, that the diſciples aſſembled *daily*, *kath èmeran*, *breaking bread*, *klōntes arten*" was every day in the week appropriated to divine ſervice? He finds in the Revelation that St. John calls it the Lord's Day, "*kuriake ēmera*,"—Rev. i, 10; but St. John does not ſay that this day, which he calls the Lord's Day, was the firſt or the laſt day of the week, or of the month. If this Edinburgh caſtigator knows it to be the firſt day of the week, he muſt know it by inſpiration, or by tradition, or from his *ob*; there is no other poſſible mean of knowing it.

He alſo finds in the ſcriptures the doctrine of infant baptiſm; for there is nothing which his ſpirit of divination does not enable him to find in the ſcriptures, if you except theſe truths of faith, which are not to be reconciled with the opinions, which he lends his diſciples: from theſe words of the apoſtle, Col. ii, 11–12, "in whom alſo you are circumciſed with the circumciſion made without hands in putting off the body of the ſins of the fleſh by the circumciſion of Chriſt buried with him

him in baptiſm," he deduces the doctrine of infant baptiſm: "it is," ſays he, p. 262, "a concluſion tolerably natural that all, who had a right to circumciſion under the Old Teſtament, poſſeſs the ſame claim under the New;" but he forgot to inform his readers that the apoſtle did not write to children, nor ſpeak of children at all in that paſſage, and this caſtigator's concluſion excludes one half of the human ſpecies from baptiſm: for the female ſex had no claim to circumciſion under the old law. Why not tell his diſciples: we have faſhioned the ſcriptures for your uſe; and in our deductions and annotations you will find the truths of faith and the maxims of morality, which it is our will that you ſhould believe? Believe then that we are your lawful paſtors and teachers, in due ſucceſſion from the apoſtles, and that theſe popiſh biſhops have intruded themſelves into the miniſtry, which of right belonged to us: would this Edinburgh caſtigator condeſcend to inform us in what book of the ſcriptures this is found? Or from what paſſage of ſcripture it is deduced? If it be neither found in the ſcriptures, nor deduced from them, on what principle is it believed by his diſciples, who have no rule of faith but the ſcriptures? Theſe are embarraſſing queſtions.

Our caſtigator has given ſome unequivocal proofs of experience in reſitting the ſcriptures, and making deductions for the uſe of his diſciples: who would have thought, if his *ob* had not told us, that the demons, ſo often mentioned in the goſpel to have been caſt out by Chriſt and his apoſtles, were not unclean ſpirits but *deified dead men* to whom divine honours ought to be paid? "If," ſays the caſtigator, p. 239, "he, [*this writer*,] be at all acquainted with antiquity, he muſt know, that demons were not viewed by the ancients as a diſtinct order of Beings but as *deified dead men*, to whom divine honours ought to be paid," ſo that legion of demons, which deſtroyed the herd of ſwine, Luke v. were *deified dead men*, not unclean ſpirits, though St. Luke, who knew

knew something of antiquity, calls them demons, verse 12, *pantes oi daimones*, *all the demons*, and in the ensuing verse he calls them *unclean spirits*, *pneumata ta akatharta*, as if to confound the unclean spirit of this Edinburgh castigator. From the scriptures thus refitted he deduces that the saints and martyrs are these deified dead men, and the pope neither less nor more than the antichrist foretold by the apostle, thus he discovers in the gospel what escaped the observation of the evangelist, and his deduction surpasses the discovery. Though he sees so distinctly in the scriptures, what the inspired writers could not see, and makes deductions, which had escaped the notice of the world for ages, he cannot see what common sense, free from illusion, must see, and what the most intelligent writers have seen, that many books of the scriptures are lost without redemption. The books of Nathan the prophet, of Samuel the seer, of Gad the seer, he denies to have been divinely inspired, because it is not said they were; and his presumption is such as to deny that, what is expressly called the *prophecy of Abijah*, and the *vision of Addo*, were divinely inspired, as if the sacred penman would call any writing not divinely inspired a *prophecy* or a *vision*. St. Austin's words on this subject are remarkable: they give a correct idea of the canonical authority of the scriptures, and clearly demonstrate on what principle the scriptures are known to be canonical; "Let us," says he, "omit the fables of these scriptures, which are called apocryphal, because their occult origin was not clearly known to the fathers, from whom the authority of the true scriptures has descended to us by the most certain and most undoubted succession, "*certissima et notissima successione;*" in these apocryphal writings, though some truth be found, yet there is no canonical authority on account of many falsehoods. We cannot deny that Enoch, seventh from Adam, has written some divine things, since Jude, in his canonical epistle, says it; but yet they are justly excluded from the canon of the scriptures, which was preserved in the temple of the Hebrew

brew people, by the diligence of the prieſts in ſucceſſion. From their antiquity they were judged to be of ſuſpected fidelity becauſe they were not produced by ſuch, as were known by uninterrupted ſucceſſion, to have legally preſerved them, and it could not be found that he had written them .... Many things, under the name of other prophets, and more recent things, under the name of apoſtles, are produced by ſectaries, all which, under the name of apocryphal writings, are by diligent examination removed from canonical authority. Aus. de Doc. ep. lib. 15. cap. 23. n. 4. Auſtin was well aſſured that Enoch wrote, but he would not acknowledge a writing then under his name, becauſe, it was not atteſted genuine by the paſtors of the church in due ſucceſſion.—This is the true principle on which the ſcriptures are believed to be divinely inſpired.

As the writings of the Fathers had been faſhioned by Illyricus, in his Catalogue of Witneſſes, our caſtigator confines himſelf to tranſcribe. He admits that "the primitive Fathers uſed the univerſal conſent of churches as an evidence againſt innovations," p. 264, he at the ſame time intimates that we make it the ground of our belief. His *ob* deceives him, and he either ignorantly or intentionally deceives his readers: our faith is grounded on revelation, and we uſe as evidence againſt innovations, the univerſal conſent of churches, by it we ſhew that the doctrines which we believe are revealed as our anceſtors did. Almoſt in the ſame breath he ſays: "St. Cyprian will ſhew how the primitive Chriſtians treated oral tradition." "Whence comes this tradition?" ſays Cyprian, "does it deſcend from the Lord's authority, or from the commands and epiſtles of the apoſtles, for theſe things are to be done which are there written;" and likewiſe, "if it be commanded in the Goſpel, or in the Epiſtles, or Acts of the Apoſtles, then let this holy tradition be preſerved." He has not told us of what tradition Cyprian ſpoke, what Cyprian ſaid of one tradition, which he did not believe to be apoſtolical, our caſtigator,

or

or his repertory, fitting it for the uſe of his diſciples, applies to oral tradition in general. Cyprian, whoſe great averſion to hereſy engaged himſelf in error, thought that he had manifeſtly deduced from the ſcriptures that the baptiſm of Sectaries is invalid; and as truth is not oppoſite to truth, he concluded that the tradition oppoſed to his erroneous opinion was not apoſtolical; though he refuſed to acknowledge this tradition, which condemned his innovation, he did not pretend that there were not many traditions truly apoſtolical. On tradition he offered the ſacrifice of the altar for the repoſe of departed ſouls—*ſee review, p.* 214. On tradition he mixed water with wine in the Lord's Cup. *ibid. p.* 203. St. Auſtin, reaſoning againſt the donatiſts, ſays: "what Cyprian admoniſhes that we recur to the fountain, that is, *to apoſtolical tradition*, and thence direct the canal to our own times is beſt and undoubtedly to be done," *Cen. Don.* Lib. 5. Cap. 26. p. 37. This venerable and accurate writer demonſtrates, that the tradition oppoſed to Cyprian's opinion was apoſtolical, becauſe it was univerſally obſerved, and not inſtituted by any general council, and then, from the principle, on which Cyprian thought the tradition not apoſtolical, that is, becauſe truth is not oppoſite to truth, he concludes that Cyprian's opinion was erroneous. On this tradition, the irreconcileable enemy of innovation, the terror of reformiſts, an error founded on reaſons ſtrong in appearance, and expoſed in all their force, by the eloquence of a Cyprian, was condemned, and Jerom, who is cited by this Edinburgh caſtigator in the ſame page, to ſhew, as he pretends, what the primitive chriſtians thought of oral tradition, in his dialogue againſt the Luciferians, after ſhewing that Cyprian's error had been condemned on tradition, refutes their error on the ſame principle. This extreme averſion to hereſy, which had engaged Cyprian in error, was the ſource of Lucifer's ſchiſm, alſo: he thought the church defiled by communicating with the prelates who had been deceived at Rimini, and with-

drew himſelf from the communion of the catholic world. "The bleſſed Cyprian," ſays Jerom, "endeavoured to avoid broken ciſterns, not to drink of ſtrange water. for that end he ſent an African Synod, on the ſubject to Stephen, biſhop of the Roman city, who was the twenty-ſixth from Peter; but the effort was vain: in the end, the very biſhops, who decreed with him that heretics ſhould be re-baptiſed, returned to the *old cuſtom*, and formed a new decree. What are we doing? This is the tradition of our anceſtors to us, and this the tradition of of their anceſtors to them;" againſt this tradition Jerom ſays, "that all Cyprian's efforts were vain; the very biſhops who had adopted his opinion in Africa, renounced it," he then ſhews, in oppoſition to Lucifer's new opinion, that Sectaries had been at all times admitted on their repentance. "If," ſays he, "any man thinks it can be denied that heretics have been thus admitted by our anceſtors, let him read Cyprian's epiſtles, and his ſtrictures on Stephen, biſhop of the Roman city; and the error of that inveterate cuſtom; or let him read the books on re-baptiſation, which Hilarius has publiſhed againſt us, and he will find Hilarius himſelf to acknowledge that all ſectaries have been in a like manner received to repentance by Julius Melchiades, Sylveſter (R. P.) and all other the ancient biſhops."

To this paſſage from Cyprian, our caſtigator ſubjoins a paſſage taken from St. Jerom's book againſt Helvidius, —has he ſeen that work?—What infatuation!—to cite a work expreſsly written againſt the doctrines which he himſelf teaches! Helvidius, an ignorant and fanatical Arian in Jerom's time, publiſhed a work in which he pretended to prove that the Virgin Mary did not continue a virgin after the birth of Chriſt, but that ſhe had other children by Joſeph, this error adopted by modern reformiſts in oppoſition to the ſettled doctrine of the Catholic world, Jerom refutes in the very work from which our caſtigator gives an extract for the condemnation of popery. Jerom replies to the paſſages of ſcripture in which

Mary

Mary is called Joſeph's wife, and his brothers and ſiſters are mentioned, and explains them in the intended ſenſe, (the ſenſe in which they were always underſtood before that impious fanatic had faſhioned them to his impiety,) on the authority of tradition. Jerom demonſtrates that the mother of the Redeemer continued a virgin to her death though it be not expreſsly written. In the ſame work he ſhews, from St. Paul the ſuperior excellence of perpetual chaſtity which the unclean ſpirit of this modern Helvidius deteſts. From this work, profeſſedly written in ſupport of an article of doctrine founded on apoſtolical tradition, that is, the perpetual virginity of Mary, the Author of our Caſtigator's repertory garbles an extract to induce a belief that Jerom diſregarded tradition. This is the greateſt ſtretch of impoſture, the moſt barefaced and impudent impoſture that the writer remembers to have ſeen. Jerom thought it a monſtrous impiety to ſuppoſe that the womb of the virgin, the choſen temple of God, conſecrated to the inconceivable myſtery of the incarnation of his only begotten Son, ſanctified by the reſidence of Jeſus Chriſt for nine long months, ſhould be prophaned; in truth the indecency of the ſuppoſition has ſomething horrible in it, and manifeſtly indicates the enmity of the unclean ſpirit. Helvidius had ſaid that there was not more impropriety or indecency in ſuppoſing that the virgin had other children beſides Jeſus Chriſt, than in ſaying that God was born of a woman. This ſentiment he expreſſed in coarſe language, part of which Jerom reluctantly recites and in chaſte language ſubjoins other humiliations to which the Saviour ſubmitted, adding, "the more humiliating theſe things, which he has ſuffered for me, the more I owe him;" and when, ſays he, to Helvidius, you have recapitulated all theſe, you will produce nothing more ignominious than the croſs, which we believe, and profeſs, and in which we overcome our enemies; but as we do not deny theſe (the humiliations of Chriſt) which are written, ſo we reject theſe (the humiliations of Mary) which

which are not written. We believe that God was born of a virgin, becauſe we read it, but we do not believe Mary to have married after her child-birth, becauſe we do not read it. . . . . you ſay that Mary did not continue a virgin. I vindicate ſomething more, that Joſeph himſelf, by Mary, was a virgin, that of this virginal marriage, a virginal Son might be born.

Artfully concealing the ſubject of Jerom's work, in the face of truth this paſſage is cited, which the writer gives in the original language now before him: "*Sed ut hoc, quæ ſcripta ſunt non negamus, ita ea quæ non ſunt ſcripta renuimus, but as we do not deny theſe things, which are written, ſo we reject thoſe things, which are not written.*" The paſſage is fitted for the intended deluſion by tranſlating the pronoun *hæc, theſe things:* thus *the things* ſubſtituting the Engliſh article *the* to the Latin pronoun *hæc.* "As we deny not *the* things, which are written, ſo we reject thoſe which are not written." Thus impoſing a flagrant falſehood on the ſimplicity of his readers, that Jerom believed nothing but what was written in the ſcritures. What! Did he not believe the perpetual virginity of Mary, in defence of which he wrote that celebrated work? It is not expreſsly written. Did he not believe the perpetual chaſtity of Joſeph? It is not written. It is extremely irkſome, however neceſſary, to be obliged to detect ſuch groſs impoſture.

To this artful illuſion, manifeſtly intended by the author of the caſtigator's repertory, not by himſelf, (for the writer is perſuaded that he never ſaw the work which he cites) ſucceed ſome pages, replete with malignant invectives againſt the Catholic clergy, and calumnious miſrepreſentations, both of their views and doctrines,—their views, he knows from his familiar ſpirit,—their doctrines he refutes by bold aſſertion; they are all contrary to ſcripture, if we believe him. As aſſertion without proof only excites contempt, the writer paſſes them unnoticed; their doctrines will be diſcuſſed in due time, if health permits, and ſhown perfectly conſiſtent with the ſcriptures; not

not perhaps with that ſenſe which the unclean ſpirit of of this Edinburgh caſtigator pretends to affix to the ſcriptures. The words of the Lord are chaſte, Ps. xii. 7. *teheroth, purified;* the unclean ſpirit cannot conceive them. There are ſome extracts from Ireneus, Auſtin, and Jerom, faſhioned as uſual, to deceive the ſimple and uninformed; but as the ſentiments of theſe fathers have been explained more than once already in the courſe of this work, the writer will not conſume time and paper in an uſeleſs repetition. A man is ſurpriſed to find an extract from the canon law in ſupport of new modelled doctrine, and yet more ſurpriſed, if poſſible, to ſee with what artifice it is faſhioned to the purpoſe; "If," ſays the caſtigator, p. 274, "the R. (this writer) turn his attention to the canon law, he will find it a ſtrenuous ſupporter of Proteſtant principles;"—ſo ſtrenuous a ſupporter of Proteſtant principles, that Luther, in one of his pious fits, burned the Decretals in Wirtemberg, T. ii. f. 123. He then tranſcribes from his repertory a citation from the eleventh cauſe, qu. 3. C. 101. "If any one command what God hath forbidden, or forbid what God has commanded, he is to be accurſed of all that love God; and if any require any thing beſide the will of God, or what God has evidently required in ſcripture, he is to be conſidered as a falſe witneſs of God, and a ſacrilegious perſon. In Gratien's Work the chapter is thus expreſſed; *non eſt obediendum quod contra Deum precipitur.*

Si is qui præeſt, fecerit, aut cuiquam, quod a domino prohibitum eſt, facere juſſerit; vel quod præcepitum eſt præterierit aut præterire mandaverit, ſancti Pauli Apoſtoli ſententia ei ingerenda eſt: "*etiamſi nos aut Angelus de Cælo evangelizaverit vobis præterquam quod vobis evangelizavimus Anathema ſit. Si quis prohibet vobis quod a domino præceptum eſt vel rurſus imperat fieri quod dominus prohibet execrabilis ſit omnibus qui diligent Deum. Is qui præeſt ſi præter quod in ſanctis ſcripturis evidenter præcipitur dicit aliquid vel imperat tanquam falſus teſtis Dei aut ſacrilegus habeatur.* "*If he, who preſides, ſhall do, or ſhall command any perſon to do, what is prohibited by the Lord;*

Lord ; or shall pass by, or shall command to pass by. what is commanded ; the sentence of the apostle Paul is to be opposed to him : " though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you beside that which we have preached to you, let him be an Anetheme. If any one forbids you what is commanded by the Lord, or again commands to be done what the Lord forbids, let him be execrable to all, who love God. If he, who presides, says or commands any thing beside (contrary) to the will of God, or beside (contrary) to what is evidently commanded in the holy scriptures, let him be considered as a false witness of God, or as SACRILEGIOUS. This is an extract, which Gratien makes from Basil the Great's monastic institutions, to shew that the precept of any superior, if manifestly against the law of God, does not oblige the subject ; hence he gives it the title—*non est abediendum quod contra deum præcipitur ; that is not to be obeyed which is commanded against God.* Who would imagine that Basil's instructions to his monks on the nature of the obedience, which they promise their superiors, would be wrested, by imposture, in support of an error so expressly condemned by that prelate, as we have already seen, that is, that there are no truths of religion believed, no rites or ceremonies instituted, but what are evidently taught in the scriptures ?

Note : The Greek preposition *para* signifies indifferently *præter*, *contra*, &c. in English *beside*, *against*, &c. the subject matter determines the sense.

After this quotation from the canon law our castigator says, " were it requisite, a multitude of quotations to the same purpose might also be produced from the most celebrated divines of the Romish church," true : in the third question of the eleventh cause, from which he has cited the 101st chapter, there are many extracts from the most celebrated writers of antiquity, which imposture might have fitted to its purpose with equal ease, and they would have made the same impressions on the uninformed mind. There is however a disagreeable consequence, the confusion which results from the detection

of

of the fraud. This chapter is closed as usual with some virulent invectives against catholics in general, and this writer in particular, who is, with new modelled politeness, compared to Judas, and charitably consigned to perdition. His seventh chapter opens with an unmeaning preamble, about the institution of the sacrament of the Eucharist, or, as he calls it, the Lord's supper, as it is intended to discuss this article with that accuracy which the great importance of the subject exacts; and to that extent, which its magnitude requires, the writer will for present confine himself to a few cursory remarks on this Edinburgh castigator's compilation: p. 278, he says: "the Lord's supper is dispensed to the church in the form of a *common repast*, which according to the appointment of God, and the practice of good men, is set apart *for the support of the body*, by an address to the father of mercies;" in this view of the sacrament the most consummate ignorance is blended with the most sacrilegious impiety: he gives for apostolical doctrine the abuse against which the apostle denounced the most dreadful judgment. "He, says the apostle, who eateth and drinketh unworthily, *eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body*"—1 Cor. xi, 29. From what could the body of the Lord be discerned or distinguished if not from the common food, which supports the body? Not to distinguish the body of the Lord from common food, is what constitutes the crime of the unworthy communicant, against whom the apostle denounces judgment; this castigator blasphemously calls it *a common repast for the support of the body!* there is something horrible in the blasphemy. Does he imagine that the Saviour and his disciples made two suppers, one immediately after the other, for the support of the body? If not, the eucharist was not intended for the support of the body. It was instituted after supper, *meta to deipnesai*.—Luke xx, 20.

As this true disciple of Epicurus has new modelled even the Eucharist, and fitted it for the support of the body,

body, ſo he has new modelled an eſſential rite, the form of conſecration. Papiſts, as he truly ſays, think it conſiſts in the words of Chriſt, "*this is my body, this is my blood*" "This, their opinion," he ſays, "is repugnant to ſcripture and antiquity." To this form, by his own apoſtolical authority, he ſubſtitutes a prayer and thankſgiving, which not being found in ſcripture every enthuſiaſt may invent or model to his own fancy. It is true he cites from St. Paul, what he ignorantly calls an addreſs to the father of mercies. "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refuſed if it be received with thankſgiving, for it is ſanctified by the word of God and prayer"—1ſt Tim. iv, 4. This, however, is not the prayer by which the elements are conſecrated: for the euchariſt was inſtituted, and in conſtant uſe, many years before St. Paul wrote his epiſtle to Timothy, ſome years before St. Paul was himſelf a chriſtian, and what ſhews the ignorance of this Edinburgh aſs, in the moſt contemptible point of view, theſe words of the apoſtle contain neither an addreſs to the father of mercies, nor a thankſgiving. St. Paul inſtructs the faithful, and warns them againſt the artifices and errors of falſe teachers: "the apoſtle," ſays Jerom, "writing againſt that Epicurean reformiſt apoſtate Monk Jovinian, deſignates *Tatian Marcion* and other heretics, who proclaim perpetual abſtinence, to deſtroy and contemn the works of the Creator, which are to them abominable; but we praiſe every creature of God, and yet we prefer leanneſs to fatneſs, abſtinence to luxury, and faſting to fulneſs." How unlike our caſtigator! who, adding folly to ignorance, cites, in ſupport of his epicurean impiety, a paſſage from Jerom's letter to Evagrius, which the author of his repertory has artfully faſhioned to the purpoſe: "upon the prayer of the preſbyters the body and blood of Chriſt is made." In that letter, which this caſtigator cites from his repertory, Jerom profeſſedly demonſtrates that the prieſt is ſuperior to the deacon. The firſt argument which he offers in ſupport

port of his doctrine is the power of conſecrating the elements of the euchariſt, veſted in the prieſt from which the deacon is excluded.—" What is it," ſays he, " that the miniſter of tables and widows (the deacon) ſwelled with pride, ſhould exalt himſelf above thoſe (the Prieſts) at whoſe prayers the body and blood of Chriſt are made preſent ?" *ad quorum preces Chriſti corpus et ſanguis conficitur ?* " *Conficitur*" is an expreſſion in perpetual uſe with Latin writers, to ſignify that, by the words of conſecration, the elements of bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Jeſus Chriſt. By concealing the ſubject of the letter, and changing a few words, an extract, in which the catholic doctrine of the converſion of the ſubſtance of the bread and wine into the ſubſtance of the body and blood of Jeſus Chriſt is expreſſed with the utmoſt preciſion, is wreſted in ſupport of the oppoſite error. This paſſage, in its obvious ſenſe, is deſtructive of the whole plan of Calvin's pretended reformation: for if the principle of proof, aſſumed by Jerom, be founded in truth, that is, that the power of conſecrating the elements of bread and wine for the euchariſt, be excluſively veſted in the prieſt, not in the deacon, much leſs in the meer laymen, where there is no prieſt of primitive inſtitution, there is no conſecration of elements, no euchariſt, no church of Chriſt : for by the uſe of this adorable myſtery, the death of the Lord is announced until he comes—1ſt Cor. xi, 26.

Jerom does not found his argument on the form of prayer uſed by the prieſt in the conſecration of the elements, nor does he ſay in what the form conſiſts : the argument would have been null : for the ſame form might have been uſed by the deacon, or by any old woman, he founds his argument on the power of conſecrating the elements veſted in the prieſt by his ordination, not in the deacon, and thus at once excludes from the miniſtry all ſelf-conſtituted teachers and paſtors, reducing to the common level themſelves and their conventicles. " Where there is no prieſt," ſaid he, in his

dialogue againſt the Luciferians, "there is no church;" and, in this letter to Evagrius, he confines ordination to the biſhop: "The deacon Hilarius," ſaid he in the dialogue, "having neither biſhops nor prieſts, cannot make the euchariſt. "*Euchariſtiam conficere non poteſt.*"

He muſt have learned from his *ob*, that to think the elements are conſecrated by Chriſt's words, "*this is my body*," is repuguant to ſcripture and antiquity. Does he believe that Chriſt himſelf did conſecrate the elements? We do not find in the ſcriptures any other form of conſecration: theſe words: "*take and eat*," were addreſſed to the apoſtles, not uſed to conſecrate the elements; and theſe alſo: "*do this in remembrance of me*," did not conſecrate the elements; but they conſecrated the apoſtles prieſts, and veſted in them a power of doing what Chriſt had done, that is, of conſecrating the elements in the ſame manner, and conſequently by the ſame words by which the Saviour himſelf did conſecrate, and in this ſenſe all antiquity underſtood them: Tertullian, in his book againſt Marcien, ſays: *that Chriſt made the bread his body, ſaying:* "*this is my body*,"—ſee Review, p. 207.

Cyprian, in his ſermon on the Lord's ſupper, ſays, that "Chriſt conſecrated the elements by theſe words, *this is my body*, *this is my blood*, and that his mininſters conſecrate them by the ſame words: "this, ſaid he, (Jeſus Chriſt) *is my body*," they, (the apoſtles) eat and drank of the ſame food according to the viſible form; but before theſe words, that common food was only uſeful to nouriſh the body, and adminiſtered a ſupport to corporal life; however ſince the time that it was ſaid by the Lord: *do this in remembrance of me: this is my fleſh, this is my blood*, as often as it is done with theſe words and with this faith, that ſubſtantial bread and cup, conſecrated by a ſolemn benediction, contributes to the life and ſalvation of the *whole man*, being at the ſame time a remedy and a ſacrifice *(holocauſtum)* to heal infirmities and purge iniquities."

Theſe

Theſe are of the moſt ancient Latin writers whoſe works have eſcaped the deſtructive hand of time. On this ſubject there is a perfect coincidence of the ancients, Greeks and Latins: Gregory of Nyſſa, brother to Baſil the Great, in his catechetical oration, ch. 37, ſays: "it muſt be conſidered how it can be that one body, which is always diſtributed to ſo many thouſands of the faithful in the whole world, is entire, in each ſeparately, and remains entire in itſelf." To this, the greateſt difficulty which is, or can be, propoſed, againſt the corporal preſence of Jeſus Chriſt in the euchariſt, this ancient, venerable and learned prelate replies: "the body of Chriſt by the inhabitation of the *word of God*, (the ſecond perſon of the Trinity) has been tranſmitted into the divine dignity. Juſtly, therefore, I now believe the bread ſanctified by the word of God, to be tranſmitted into the body of the *word* (Jeſus Chriſt) for this bread, as the apoſtle ſays, is ſanctified by the word of God and prayer, not that through the medium of food, "*medianto cibo*," it becomes the body of the *word* (Chriſt) but that it is immediately tranſmitted into the body of the *word* (Chriſt) as it is was ſaid by the *word: this is my body.*"

Euſebius of Emiſſa, a diſciple of Euſebius of Cæſarea, the great hiſtorian, in his fifth ſermon on the Eaſter, ſays: "the inviſible prieſt changed the viſible creatures *(the bread and wine)* into the ſubſtance of his body and blood by his word, his ſecret power, ſaying: take and eat: *this is my body*, and with a repeated ſanctification, take and eat: *this is my blood*" It is thought by ſome critics that the homilies, aſcribed to Euſebius, of Emiſſa, were written by St. Hilary, of Arles, who flouriſhed in the beginning of the fourth century. This opinion, if true, only adds weight to the teſtimony, as Hilary, though not ſo ancient as Euſebius, ſurpaſſed him in ſcience and ſanctity. Chryſoſtom, ſuperior to both, from his eloquence called the Chriſtian Plato, in his ſecond homily on the 2d. Tim. demonſtrates that the euchariſt, though conſecrated by a wicked prieſt, is

not

not leſs holy in itſelf, nor leſs ſanctifying to the faithful who receive it worthily, than if it had been conſecrated by Peter or Chriſt himſelf. "As," ſays he, "the words, which Chriſt ſpoke, are the ſame, which the prieſts now pronounce, ſo the oblation is the ſame: this is equally true of baptiſm."

In this ſecond homily to the people of Antioch he inſtitutes a compariſon between Elias and Chriſt: "Elias," ſays he, "left his ſheep-ſkin (mantle) to his diſciple; the Son of God aſcending left us his fleſh, but Elias aſcended ſtripped of his mantle, the Son of God *left us his fleſh and aſcended with it.* Let us not be depreſſed in mind nor lament, let us not fear the difficulty of the times: for what will he refuſe to do for our ſalvation, who did not refuſe to ſpill his blood for all, and again communicated to us his fleſh and that ſame blood?" Is there any modern papiſt who ſpeaks of the corporal preſence of Chriſt in the euchariſt in terms more ſimple or more clearly expreſſive than theſe ancient writers? Without ſhadow of variation, they all agree that the Saviour conſecrated the elements by theſe words: *this my body; this is my blood*, and that he continues to conſecrate them by the ſame words pronounced by his miniſters: "for it is not man, who makes the things propoſed from the conſecration of the altar the body and blood of Chriſt, but he, who was crucified for us, the Chriſt; the words are pronounced by the prieſt, but the propoſed things are conſecrated by the power of God and his grace: '*this*,' he ſays, '*is my body.*' By this word the propoſed things are conſecrated..... that word was ſaid, indeed, but once, but yet on all the altars of the church until the preſent day, and even until the coming of Chriſt, it gives firmneſs to the ſacrifice..... you haſten to the holy and terrible ſacrifice; renew the concealed myſteries of the oblation; Chriſt ſlain is propoſed."—*Homily on the treachery of Judas.* This is the language of theſe celebrated writers of antiquity, whom the world revered, and continues to revere. His *ob*, therefore,

therefore, has moſt groſsly deceived the caſtigator, when he taught him to believe that the opinion of papiſts is repugnant to antiquity, and, deceived by *ob*, this caſtigating paſtor moſt cruelly deceives his diſciples.

Some pages are filled with a tireſome repetition of the ſame difficulty againſt the corporal preſence of Chriſt in the euchariſt, which the diſciples, who deſerted the Saviour, ſtated againſt it when firſt propoſed to their belief. John vi, 52, *how can this man give us his fleſh to eat?* They did not believe the Saviour omnipotent. Does this Edinburgh caſtigator? The writer doubts it: for his omnipotence once admitted, all theſe difficulties, founded on pretended contradictions and impoſſibilities, vaniſh: it is admitted, that almighty power can create a body in any given place. If ſo, that ſame power can re-produce that ſame body in any given place: for it is not more difficult to re-produce a body, already exiſting, in any given place, than it is to give that ſame body an exiſtence in that place when it had no exiſtence at all. To compare difficulties the latter is certainly the greater: for our imagination may, in ſome manner, reach the former; but the latter, that is, to give an exiſtence to a body which does not exiſt at all, is beyond its utmoſt ſtretch. Thus plain reaſoning refutes in an inſtant all theſe pretended impoſſibilities which alarm ſimplicity: for if it be poſſible, as it manifeſtly is, to re-produce the ſame body exiſting in any place in any other given place, all theſe pretended impoſſibilities, propoſed by impoſture or ignorance, diſappear. Our caſtigator's *ob* forgot to inform him that all theſe difficulties, with which he has ſwelled his volume, and others which were not found in his repertory, had been accurately diſcuſſed in the work which he pretends to refute, but did not read. —ſee Review, from p. 178 to p. 214.

He makes an aukward attempt to invalidate the teſtimony of the Council of Nice, adduced by this writer in his Remarks: "when," ſays the caſtigator, p. 291, "theſe fathers ſaid: the Lamb of God, which taketh away

away the ſins of the world, is placed upon the ſacred table," they forgot to add, " corporeally." If they had been as ignorant as this caſtigator, they might have added ſomething equally abſurd ; but the fathers knew that Chriſt is the Lamb of God, as Man, in his adorable humanity, that he could not have been on the ſacred table as man, without his body and ſoul.

He next attempts to elude the teſtimony of St. Andrew, by a conjecture of Dupin, who could not himſelf evade it, though in oppoſition to St. Bernard, Baronius, Bellarmine, Lanfranc and other writers, as far ſuperior to Dupin as Dupin was to this Edinburgh ſcribbler, that lurking hypocrite offered every conjecture which artifice could ſuggeſt to induce a ſuſpicion of interpolation in the acts of St. Andrew, written by the prieſts of Achaia where he ſuffered, and from his conjectures pretends to conclude that it was to be eſteemed a *dubious writing*, which cannot be applied, as St. Jerom declares to prove any doctrine of faith : however, as Dupin retracted his errors, it is not neceſſary to refute him ; by his retractation he has refuted himſelf, and if he had not, this writer would find no difficulty in ſhewing that conjectures do not invalidate facts ; that, if artful conjectures were ſufficient to invalidate the authenticity of works, there would not be an authentic work in being ; becauſe there is not a book, even of the ſcriptures, againſt which conjectures apparently more ſolid than theſe of Dupin, may not, and have not been propoſed.

If on other ſubjects he has been unlucky in his citations from the Fathers, he has been doubly ſo on this ; " it will be granted," he ſays, p. 295, " that theſe writers have frequently called bread and wine the body and blood of Chriſt ; and in doing ſo they are authoriſed by the expreſſions of ſcripture." His *ob* deceives him, the Fathers did not call bread and wine the body and blood of Chriſt, nor do the ſcriptures authoriſe ſuch expreſſions : for the ſcriptures do not authoriſe nonſenſe, but they frequently called the body and blood of Chriſt,

bread

bread and wine, authorised by the scriptures, and by common sense, because in the eucharist the body and blood of Christ are bread and wine in appearance and effect; but bread and wine are not the body and blood of Christ either in appearance or effect, or in any possible sense which could authorise such a nonsensical expression as this castigator lends from his own stock to the scriptures and the Fathers.—See this error refuted, Review, p. 204. "But," continues the castigator, "it is evident from their writings, that they never supposed any change in these elements." The contrary of this assertion is true, and if this ignorant scribbler does not know it, it is because he knows nothing of the writings of these venerable ancients, but the few garbled extracts, which he transcribes from his repertory. The writer has already shewn that both Greeks and Latins say that the bread and wine are converted into the body and blood of Jesus Christ by his words: "*this is my body, this is my blood,*" a conversion which they ascribe to the almighty power of God. The writer adds to the passages already adduced these words of St. Ambrose, an ancient writer of unquestionable authority, in his sixth book on the sacraments, Cap. 1, N. 1, he says: "as our Lord Jesus Christ is the true Son of God, not as men are by grace, but as Son of the substance of the Father, so the flesh which we receive, as he himself said, is true flesh," thus he demonstrates that as Jesus Christ, though in appearance man, was in reality the true Son of God, so the adorable eucharist, though in appearance bread, is true flesh. "But," continues Ambrose, "perhaps you may say what the disciples of Christ then said, hearing him say: "if a man do not eat my flesh, and drink my blood, he will not remain in me, nor have eternal life," perhaps you may say: "how true? I who see the similitude, do not see the truth of the blood." To this supposed objection Ambrose replies: "first of all things I have told you of the word of Christ which operates, that it

can

can change and convert the inſtituted kinds of nature "*Genera inſtituta naturæ.*" Ambroſe thought the almighty power of Jeſus Chriſt ſufficient to effect the converſion of one ſubſtance into another, without making any change in the appearance to ſenſe: the man who does not think it, is unaccountably ignorant, or monſtrouſly impious.

Our caſtigator has alſo in his great zeal to exclude the real preſence of Chriſt from the euchariſt, as well as his paternal protection from the church, has given us a ſpecimen of his philoſophical reſearches; "Can," ſays he, "the exiſtence of colours be conceived unconnected with matter? Or a taſte and ſmell without any object to taſte or ſmell?" He too with the reformed Mr. Norris, and many a good old wife, thinks that colours, taſte and ſmell, exiſt in external objects compoſed of matter; other philoſophers, who judge by the rules of common ſenſe, think them ſenſations of the ſoul, of which external objects are the occaſional cauſes, not the efficient; which may, and often have been, excited by God the efficient cauſe, without the interference of any material object or occaſional cauſe: with what matter was the colour of the dove, under the appearance of which, the Holy Ghoſt was ſeen to deſcend on the Saviour connected? Was the Holy Ghoſt a lump of matter? The writer is tired of refuting ſuch nonſenſe, there are as many errors inſulting reaſon as well as religion in almoſt every page of this Edinburgh ſcribbler's compilation as would take a volume to refute: he tells us, p. 295, that the Fathers thought the euchariſt meerly a ſymbolical mode of exhibiting truth to the mind, and baptiſm an ordinance of the ſame kind. He then cites paſſages from the Fathers, in which the corporal preſence of Chriſt is as clearly expreſſed as words can expreſs it. For inſtance: Fulgentius ſays: "that every believer is then made a partaker of Chriſt's body and blood when he is made in baptiſm a member of Chriſt's body,"—de Bap. Æthiop.—and what Fulgentius ſaid of the euchariſt, which was received

received by the new Chriſtians immediately after baptiſm, this caſtigator either through ignorance or impoſture applies to baptiſm itſelf. If he had read Jerom's dialogue againſt the Luciferians, from which, if the writer recollects rightly, he had cited ſome garbled extract, he would have known that the ſacrament of the euchariſt accompanied that of baptiſm: for Jerom ſays: that Hilary being but a deacon, having neither biſhops nor prieſts, could not conſecrate the euchariſt, nor give baptiſm without the euchariſt: *nec Baptiſma tradere ſine Euchariſtia.*" He cites from Chryſoſtom, Theodoret Gelaſius, whom the author of his repertory, Illyricus of lying memory, calls pope, and he repeats it, for the man honeſtly tranſcribes paſſages in which the corporal preſence is preciſely expreſſed, but the nature of the bread is ſaid to remain. All theſe the writer had already diſcuſſed, and ſhewn that by the nature of the bread they underſtood what logicians now call the metaphyſical eſſence, theſe attributes by which they diſtinguiſh accidents from ſubſtance, and in theſe ſymbols there is no change,—See Review, p. 210.

The paſſage cited from Chryſoſtom, was quoted by Peter Martyr in his book againſt Gardiner; it is not found in Chryſoſtom's works, though the writer, whoever he be, is perfectly orthodox. There is a quotation from St. Ireneus garbled, and falſified. It is thus ſtated by our caſtigator: "that which is bread from the earth, perceiving the call of God, is not now common bread, but the euchariſt, conſiſting of two things, the one earthly and the other ſpiritual."—Lib. 4, cap. 34. In that chapter this venerable and moſt ancient writer, who had learned the doctrines of chriſtianity from Polycarp the evangeliſt, St. John's diſciple, proves againſt ſectaries, the reſurrection of the fleſh, on this principle, that the fleſh and blood of Chriſt in the euchariſt, being immortal and incorruptible, communicates immortality and incorruption to our bodies, "how again," ſays he, "do they ſay, that the fleſh which is nouriſhed with

the body and blood of the Lord, will come into corruption and not receive life? . . . . For as the bread which is from the earth receiving the vocation of God is not now common bread, but the eucharist, consisting of two things, the one earthly the other cœlestial, so our bodies receiving the eucharist are not now corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection."

Ireneus assumes, as a principle of demonstration, that is, as an unquestionable truth, that our bodies are nourished with the body and blood of Christ. From this principle he concludes that our bodies have in them a source of immortality and incorruption, and on it he founds a certain hope of our resurrection. To illustrate this truth he institutes a comparison, as the bread, which is a production of the earth, and consequently in itself and of its own nature, corruptible, by the invocation and power of God, is converted into the eucharist, in which there is one thing celestial, that is, the body and blood of Christ, which is incorruptible and immortal, and one thing terrestial, that is, the *species*, which as to appearance is corruptible, so our bodies by receiving the eucharist have in them a source and principle of immortality and incorruption, though they appear mortal and incorruptible. So well assured were these primitive Christians of the apostolical times, that the body and blood of Christ were really in the eucharist, and received by the faithful in that adorable sacrament, that from this mystery so far remote from human sense, and transcending human reason, Ireneus demonstrates another mystery not less opposite to sense and experience, nor less transcending human reason, that is, the resurrection of our bodies on the last day. He resumes the same argument in his fifth book,—cap. 2, in which, after shewing that our flesh must of all necessity rise immortal, because it is nourished by the body and blood of Jesus Christ, things immortal and incorruptible, he says: "as the vine, planted in the earth, produces its fruit in its time; and the grain of wheat falling on the earth, and

dissolved

diſſolved, riſe manifold by the ſpirit of God, which contains all things ; which after by wiſdom come into uſe for men, and receiving the word of God become the euchariſt, that is, the body and blood of Chriſt, ſo our bodies nouriſhed by it, and repoſed in the earth and diſſolved, will riſe in their time, the word of God giving them a reſurrection to the glory of the Father."

He compares the human body to the grain of wheat ; they are both diſſolved in the earth, and in appearance reduced to their component elements; but there is in the grain of wheat a vegetative principle from nature, in virtue of which it riſes again in a more flouriſhing condition, and in the human body a principle of life and immortality communicated by the immortal body of Jeſus Chriſt in the euchariſt, in virtue of which the human body will riſe immortal and incorruptible. To garble an extract from a work, in oppoſition to a doctrine there taught, with more force, preciſion and perſpicuity than in any of our modern controverſial works, muſt be the effect of the moſt blind infatuation, or the moſt unbluſhing impoſture.

As there is an extenſive work preparing for the Preſs in which this, and other doctrines are vindicated from miſrepreſentation, and all the exceptions which this Edinburgh caſtigator has tranſcribed from his repertory are minutely diſcuſſed, the writer diſmiſſes the ſubject for the preſent.

Laus Chriſto ejusque Matri
Mariæ ſemper Virgini.

E. B. V. G. Q.

ERRATA CORRECTA.

Page 7,	line 22.	*Pec.*—*Oecolompadius*
11,	4,	*probably*,—*privately*
12,	37,	*eik*,—*eikō*
39,	32,	doubted ?"
44,	4,	cer,—cor
47,	6,	ſays, the cas.— , ſays the caſti.
47,	12,	caſtigator. as.—caſtigator, as
78,	20,	Grelaſius,—Gelaſius
105,	6,	aſſemble,—aſſembly
119,	34,	*Monday*,—*Sunday*
134,	34,	illuſion,—*a*lluſion
172,	15,	calumnate,—calum*niate*
189,	18,	acquainted.—acquainted ?
196,	3,	who,—whom
267,	37,	that,—that *is*
277,	24,	Volumn,—*Volume*
298,	30,	diſtinguiſh *between* the true
333,	18,	cleram,—clerum
335,	1,	Norbornnœ,—Narbonnœ
337,	36,	Patroka*s*,—Patrokōs
347,	33,	Scriptures. take,— , take
395,	14,	tranſmitted,—tranſmuted
—,	16,	ditto,———ditto
—,	21,	ditto,———ditto

H/A-5357

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

H&SS
A
5357